DATI (CARLO), Professor of Philology at *Florence*, where he was born, became very famous, as well for his Works, as for the Elogies which many Writers bestowed upon him [*A*]. He was very civil and officious to all learned Travellers who went to *Florence*; many of them expressed their Acknowledgment for it in their Writings (*a*). He was a Member of the Academy *della Crusca*, and in that quality he took the Name of *Smarrito*. He made a Panegyric upon *Lewis* XIV, in *Italian*, and published it at *Florence*, in the Year 1669 (*b*). The *French* Translation of it, was printed at *Rome* the Year following. He had already published some *Italian* Poems in praise of that Prince (*c*). You may thereby learn in what Time he flourished.

(*a*) *See* Leti's *Italia Regnante*, Parte 3, pag. 369, & seq. *Konig* refers us to pag. 170 of that Book. He has committed two Faults; for he does not specify the Volume, and quotes the Page wrong.

(*b*) Ibid. pag. 367.

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 363, 367.

[*A*] *He became very famous, as well for his Works, as for the Elogies that many Writers bestowed upon him.*] You may find the Commentary, that this Text requires, in the third Volume of *Leti*'s *Italia Regnante*: I shall only transcribe a few Lines out of it. *Leti* (1) observes, that the Book intituled, *Lettera di Timauro Antiate à Filaleti, della vera storia della cicloide, e della famosissima esperienza dell' argento vivo*, was written by *Carlo Dati*: he refers us to the One hundred and forty ninth page of *Placcius*'s *Treatise, De Scriptis & Scriptoribus anonymis atque pseudonymis*. This Reference is right; for we find in that Page, that the pretended *Timauro Antiate* is *Carlo Dati*, and that this appears plainly from the Twenty sixth Page of the Letter. We find there also, that this Piece was printed at *Florence* in the Year 1663, and that the Author proves two things: the one, that Father *Mersenne* is not the Inventer of the Cycloid, as is said in the History of the Cycloid, but that the Glory of that Invention belongs to *Galileo*; the other, that *Torricelli* is innnocent of the Plagiarism imputed to him concerning the Hypothesis, whereby the Suspension of the Quick-silver is explained by the Pressure of the Air. He was the first Author of that Hypothesis, if we believe *Carlo Dati*. It is very likely, that *Monconys* confounds things, when he says, *The Sieur* Carlo Dati *gave me his printed Letter to prove that* Torricelli *was the first that found out the* Cycloid (2). The chief Work, to which our *Dati* applied himself, was That *della Pittura antica*. He published an Essay, or a Piece of it, in the Year 1667. I will cite it hereafter (3). The Encomium that *Chimentelli* bestowed upon this Writer, is the only one that I shall transcribe among many others alledged by *Leti*. 'Nec secus inter rarissimos numerandus, qui Librum utendum permisit Clarissimus & amicissimus D. Carolus Datus nostræ flos illibatus Urbis, suadæque Etruscæ medulla, quam omni literarum paratu quotidie auget, atque illustrat. Parum enim mereri putat, qui per se tàm egregiè meretur, nisi ad benè merendum de Republica Literaria alios quoque omni ope & consilio adjuvet. Nihil ut minus suum habeat, quam quod in usum & gloriam eruditionis impendi possit; penè ipsum se sibi subtrahens, nedum temporis, aut operæ parcus (4). —— *Nor is* Carlo Dati, *an eminent Scholar, and a most obliging Friend, who favoured me with the Use of the Book, to be mentioned without the highest Esteem, as being the* unsullied Flower of our City, *the Soul of* Tuscan *Eloquence, which he daily improves and embellishes with acquisitions from all parts of Learning. Yet he esteems his Merit small, unless he assists others with all his Abilities to deserve well of the Common-Wealth of Learning: so that he may be said to have nothing less his own, than that which may be employed for the Advancement or Honour of Learning, and to overact his Strength, neither sparing Time nor Labour.*'

(1) Leti, *Italia Regnante*, Tom. III, pag. 363, 364.

(2) Monconys, *Voyage*, Part. II. pag. 483, *at the Year* 1664.

(3) *In the Remark* [L] *of the Article* ZEUXIS.

(4) Chimentellius de honore Bisellii, pag. 86, apud Leti *Italia Regnante*, Tom. III, pag. 373.

DAVID, King of the *Jews*, was one of the greatest Men in the World, even tho' we should not consider him as a Royal Prophet, who was after GOD's own Heart. The first time that the Scripture makes him appear on the Stage of the World (*a*), is to inform us that *Samuel* appointed him King, and performed the Ceremony of anointing him. *David* was then but a meer Shepherd. He was the youngest of the eight Sons of *Jesse* the *Bethlehemite* [*A*]. Afterwards the Scripture tells us, that he was sent to King *Saul* (*b*), to cure him of his Fits of Frenzy, by the Sound of his Musical Instruments. A Service of that Importance made him so much beloved by *Saul*, that he kept him in his House, and made him his Armour-Bearer (*c*). The Scripture says afterwards (*d*), that *David* used to go home from time to time to take care of his Father's Flocks, and that his Father sent him one Day to *Saul*'s Camp, with some Provisions for three of his Sons that were in the Army. *David*, performing that Order, heard the Challenge that a *Philistine*, called *Goliah*, proud of his Strength and gigantic Stature, made daily to the *Israelites*, which none among them durst to accept. He expressed his great Desire to fight that Giant; whereupon he was brought to the King, and assured him that he should triumph over That *Philistine*. *Saul* gave him his Armour; but *David*, finding it troublesome, put it off, and resolved to make use only of his Sling; which he did so happily, that he brought down that Swaggerer with a Stone (*e*), and killed him

(*a*) 1 Sam. xvi, 13.

(*b*) Ibid. ver. 10.

(*c*) Ibid. ver. 21.

(*d*) Ibid. chap. xvii, ver. 15.

(*e*) Ibid. ver. 49, 50.

[*A*] *He was the youngest of the Sons of* Jesse *the* Bethlehemite.] *Jesse* descended in a direct Line from *Judah*, one of the twelve Sons of *Jacob*, and dwelt at *Bethlehem*, a small City of the Tribe of *Judah*. Some Modern *Rabbins* say, that, when *David* was conceived, his Father *Jesse* did not think that he lay with his Wife, but with his Servant Maid, and thereby explain the seventh verse of the Fifty first Psalm, wherein *David* affirms, that *he was shapen in Iniquity, and that his Mother conceived him in Sin*. This, say they, signifies that *his Father* Jesse *committed an Adultery in begetting him, because, though he begot him by his Wife, he believed that he begot him by his Servant Maid, upon whose Chastity he had made an Attempt* (1). This Explication does not well agree with the Doctrine of Original Sin, and for that reason Father *Bartolocci* (2), having mentioned that Opinion of the Modern *Rabbins*, thought himself obliged to examine whether the ancient Jews acknowledged the Truth of that Doctrine. If the Supposition of those *Rabbins* was true, they would be in the right to say, that *Jesse* had committed Adultery; but on the other side it must be said, that he would not have been guilty of it, if, sincerely believing that he was enjoying his Wife, he had got his Servant Maid with Child. This Rabbinical Supposition is very different from the Tradition mentioned by St *Jerom*. He says, that it was believed that *Jesse*, the Father of *David*, did never commit any actual Sin, and that there was no kind of Uncleanness in him but what he brought from his Mother's Womb. 'Mirum est quod de Isai patre Davidis refert Hieronymus, illum nunquam aliud peccatum commisisse quam quod ex origine contraxit. Quo enim loco legimus: *Amasa* † *ingressus est ad Abigail filiam Naas sororem Sarviæ*; sic Hieronymus ‡, *Naas interpretatur coluber, quia eum nullum admisisse moriferum perhibent peccatum, nisi quod originaliter de serpente antiquo contraxit. Est autem Naas qui & Isai pater David.* Eamdem traditionem refert Abulensis ‡, & monet Naas eumdem esse qui & Jesse sive Isai patrem Davidis, quod quidem & antea Liranus * docuerat (3). —— *St* Jerom *relates something very*

(1) *See the* Journal des Sçavans, July 14, 1692, pag. 455, Dutch Edit.

(2) In *Bibliotheca magna Rabbinica*, Part. II, pag. 4, apud *Journal des Sçavans*, ibid.

† Lib. ii, Reg. 17, 25.

‡ Hieron. Trad. Heb. in lib. 2. Reg. cap. 17.

‡ Tostat. 2. Reg. 17, Queſt. 27.

* Liran. ibid.

(3) *They are Father* Camart's *Words, and Quotations, pag.* 126, 127, de rebus gestis Eliæ.

him afterwards with his own Sword, and cut off his Head, which he preſented to *Saul* [*B*]. That Prince asked his General, when he ſaw *David* go againſt *Goliah*, *Whoſe Son is this Youth* (*f*) [*C*]? The General anſwered, that he did not know, and received Orders from *Saul* to enquire about it: but *Saul* heard it himſelf from that young Man; for, being brought to him after the Victory, he asked him, *Whoſe Son art thou?* and *David* anſwered him, that he was the Son of *Jeſſe* (*g*). Then *Saul* kept him in his Service, without ſuffering him to return to his Father (*h*). But becauſe the Songs, that were ſung in all the Cities, on the Defeat of the *Philiſtines*, aſcribed ten times more Glory to *David* than to *Saul* (*i*), the King conceived a violent Jealouſy, which increaſed daily, becauſe the Employments, that he gave to *David* to keep him from Court, ſerved only to make him more illuſtrious, and to procure him the Affection and Admiration of the *Jews*. By a falſe Policy he would make him his Son-in-law: he was in hopes that the Condition, on which he was to give him his ſecond Daughter, would deliver him from that Object of his Averſion; but he was deceived in his Cunning. He asked an hundred Foreſkins of the *Philiſtines* for his Daughter's Dowry; *David* brought him two hundred in full tale (*k*): So that, inſtead of periſhing in the Enterprize, as *Saul* hoped, he returned with a new Addition of Glory. He married *Saul*'s Daughter, whereby he became ſtill more formidable to the King (*l*): all his Expeditions againſt the *Philiſtines* were very proſperous; his Name grew famous; he was in very great Eſteem (*m*); inſomuch that *Saul*, who knew his Son-in-law's Virtue much leſs, than the Humour of the People, imagined that the Death of *David* was the only thing that could ſecure him from being dethroned. He reſolved then to be rid of him, and truſted his eldeſt Son with that Deſign, who, far from ſiding with his Father's Jealouſy, gave *David* notice of that black Conſpiracy (*n*). *David* fled, and was purſued from Place to Place, till he had given undeniable Proofs of his Probity and Fidelity to his Father-in-law, to whom he did no manner of harm on two favourable Opportunities (*o*), wherein he might eaſily have killed him; upon which *Saul* reſolved to let him alone. But as *David* feared this Prince might reſume his wicked Deſigns, he ſtill kept upon his Guard. Nay, he provided himſelf a ſafer Place of Refuge, than before, in the Land of the *Philiſtines* (*p*). He aſked of the King of *Gath* a Town to dwell in, from whence he made frequent Incurſions into the Countries round about [*D*]: and had he obtained his Deſire, he would have fought

(*f*) Ib. ver. 55.

(*g*) Ib. ver. 58.

(*h*) Ibid. chap. xviii, ver. 2.

(*i*) And the Women anſwered one another, as they played, and ſaid, Saul *hath ſlain his Thouſands, and* David *his Ten Thouſands*. Ib. ver. 7.

(*k*) Ibid. ver. 27.

(*l*) Ibid. ver. 29.

(*m*) Ibid. ver. 30.

(*n*) Ibid. chap. xix, ver. 1, 2.

(*o*) Ibid. chap. xxiv, and xxvi.

(*p*) Ibid. chap. xxvii.

' *very ſingular of* Jeſſe, *Father of* David, *that he never* ' *was guilty of any Sin, except that which is called O-* ' *riginal. For when we read*, that *Amaſa* went into *A-* ' *bigail*, the Daughter of *Nahaſh*, Siſter to *Zeruiah*; ' *Thus St* Jerom *interprets it: Nahaſh* ſignifies a Ser- ' pent; for it is ſaid, that he never committed any ' deadly Sin, but what he originally contracted from ' the old Serpent, and *Nahaſh* is the ſame with *Jeſſe* ' *David*'s Father. Abulenſis *relates the ſame Tradition*, ' *and* obſerves, that *Nahaſh* was the ſame with *Iſai* or *Jeſſe* ' *David*'s Father; which *Liranus* had already obſerved.' For the reſt, thoſe, who would adopt the Impertinence of the *Rabbins* concerning *David*'s Conception, might eaſily admit another impertinent thing, which would be to place *David* in the number of illuſtrious Baſtards. The Phyſical Reaſon, that is alledged, why Baſtards are born ſo often with ſuch great Natural Talents, might take place here on the Father's Part.

[*B*] *He killed* Goliah *with his own Sword, and cut off his Head, which he preſented to* Saul.] *Goliah*'s Weapons were preſerved as a Monument of the Glory of the *Iſraelites*. *David* carried them firſt into his Tent (4); but it is likely they were afterwards in a conſecrated Place; for we read (5) that *David*, having asked the Prieſt *Abimelech* whether he had not a Spear or Sword for him, that Prieſt anſwered him: *the Sword of* Goliah *is here wrapped up in a Cloth behind the* Ephod; *if thou wilt take that, take it. David* cauſed it to be given him. As for the Head of *Goliah*, it was carried to *Jeruſalem* (6), when *David* had choſen that City for the Capital of his Kingdom. *Joſephus* ſays poſitively, that *David* himſelf conſecrated *Goliah*'s Sword to God (7).

(4) 1 Sam. xvii, 54.

(5) Ibid. chap. xxi, ver. 8, 9.

(6) Ibid. cap. xvii, ver. 54.

(7) Joſeph. *Antiq.* lib. 6, cap. 13, & 14.

[*C*] Saul *asked his General —— whoſe Son is this Youth?*] It is ſomewhat ſtrange that *Saul* did not know *David* that Day, ſince that young Man had plaid ſeveral times on his Muſical Inſtruments before him, to diſperſe thoſe black Vapours that moleſted him. If ſuch a Narrative as this ſhould be found in *Thucydides*, or in *Livy*, all the Critics would unanimouſly conclude, that the Tranſcribers had tranſpoſed the Pages, forgot ſomething in one Place, repeated ſomething in another, or inſerted ſome prepoſterous Additions in the Author's Work. But no ſuch Suſpicions ought to be entertained of the Bible. Nevertheleſs ſome have been ſo bold as to pretend, that all the Chapters, or all the Verſes of the firſt Book of *Samuel*, are not placed as they were at firſt. It ſeems to me that the Abbot *de Choiſi* removes the Difficulty much better. ' *David* was brought be- ' fore *Saul*, *ſays he* (8), who did not know him at ' firſt, though he had ſeen him ſeveral times, when he ' ſent for him to play on the *Harp:* but as this was ' many Years before, and *David* was very young, and ' came to Court in the Quality of a Muſician, and ' was then dreſſed like a Shepherd, it can be no ' wonder that a King, full of Buſineſs, and whoſe Mind ' was diſtempered, ſhould forget the Features of a ' young Man's Face, who had nothing conſiderable in ' him.' I only wiſh he had not ſaid, I. That *Saul* had not ſeen *David* for many Years. II. That *David was very young* when he came to *Saul*'s Court in the Quality of a Muſician. There is no likelihood that he was much younger when he killed *Goliah*, than when he came the firſt time to *Saul*'s Court; for when he made his firſt Journey, he *was a mighty valiant Man, and a Man of War, and prudent in Matters* (9); he was but Thirty Years of Age, when he was elected King after the Death of *Saul*; and there muſt be neceſſarily an Interval of many Years between the Death of *Goliah*, and that of *Saul*. See the Remark, wherein I criticize *Moreri*, and the Remark [*L*].

(8) Choiſi, *Hiſtoire de la Vie de David*, pag. 8, 9, Dutch Edit. 1692.

(9) 1 Sam. xvi, 18.

[*D*] *He asked of the King of* Gath *a Town, —— from whence he made frequent Incurſions into the Countries round about.*] *David*, having dwelt ſome time in the chief City of King *Achiſh*, with his little Band of Six hundred bold Adventurers, was afraid of putting this Prince to Charges, and begged he would aſſign him ſome other place of Abode. *Achiſh* gave him the Town of *Ziklag*. *David* removed thither with his Adventurers, and ſuffered not their Swords to ruſt in their Scabbards. He often led them out in Parties, and killed, without Mercy, both Men and Women. He left nothing alive but Cattle, which was the only Booty he returned with. He was afraid, leaſt the Priſoners ſhould diſcover the whole Myſtery to *Achiſh*, and therefore he carried none of them away, but put all to the Sword, both Male and Female. The Secret, he would not have revealed, was, that the Ravages were committed not upon the Country of the *Iſraelites*, as he made the King of *Gath* believe, but upon the Lands of the ancient Inhabitants of *Paleſtine* (10). To ſpeak plainly, this Conduct was very unjuſtifiable: in order to conceal one Fault, he committed a greater. He impoſed upon a King, to whom he had Obligations, and exerciſed great Cruelty, to cover that Impoſition. If any one had asked *David*, *by what Authority*

(10) 1 Sam. chap. xxvii.

fought under the Banner of this *Philiſtine* Prince againſt the *Iſraelites* [*E*], in that unhappy War wherein *Saul* periſhed. After the Death of *Saul*, he returned into *Judea*, and was there proclaimed King by the Tribe of *Judah* (*q*). Nevertheleſs, the other Tribes ſubmitted to *Iſhboſheth*, the Son of *Saul*, which was effected by *Abner*'s Fidelity (*r*). *Abner*, who had been General of the *Army* under King *Saul*, placed *Iſhboſheth* upon the Throne, and ſupported him on it againſt the Attempts of *David:* but being full of Reſentment, becauſe *Iſhboſheth* reproved him for having taken one of *Saul*'s Concubines (*s*), he entered into a Treaty with *David* to procure him the Kingdom of *Iſhboſheth*. The Negociation would have been ſoon concluded, to the Satisfaction of *David*, if *Joab* (*t*), to revenge a private Quarrel, had not killed *Abner*. The Death of *Abner* only haſtened the Ruin of the unfortunate *Iſhboſheth*. Two of his chief Captains ſlew him, and brought his Head to *David*, who, far from rewarding them for it, as they expected, ordered them both to be put to death (*u*). The Subjects of *Iſhboſheth* quickly ſubmitted themſelves to *David*. This Prince had reigned ſeven Years and a half over the Tribe of *Judah:* afterwards he reigned about thirty Years over all *Iſrael* (*x*). This long Reign was remarkable for great Succeſs, and glorious Conqueſts. It was not much diſturbed but by the wicked Attempts of this Prince's own Children [*F*]. Theſe are commonly the Enemies which Sovereigns have moſt reaſon to fear. *David* was very near being reduced

(*q*) 2 Sam. chap. ii, ver. 4.

(*r*) Ibid. ver. 8.

(*s*) Ib. chap. iii.

(*t*) He was General of *David*'s Army.

(*u*) 2 Sam. chap. iv.

(*x*) Ibid. chap. v, ver. 5.

thority doſt thou theſe things? what could he have anſwered? Can a private perſon, as he was, a Fugitive, who finds ſhelter in the Dominions of a neighbouring Prince, have a Right to commit Hoſtilities for his own Advantage, and without a Commiſſion from the Sovereign of the Country? Had *David* any ſuch Commiſſion? on the contrary, did he not act in Oppoſition to the Intentions and Intereſt of the King of *Gath?* If a private Man, how great ſoever by Birth, ſhould behave himſelf now a-days, as *David* did on this Occaſion, he would, undoubtedly, be called by Names of little Honour. I know the moſt renowned Heroes, the moſt famous Prophets of the Old Teſtament, have ſometimes approved the putting to the Sword every thing that had Life; and therefore I ſhould be very far from calling that Cruelty, which *David* did, had he been warranted by the Order of any Prophet, or if GOD, by Inſpiration, had commanded him to do ſo: But it evidently appears, from the ſilence of the Scripture, that he did all this of his own accord.

REFLEXION upon the Conduct of *David* towards *Nabal.*

I ſhall add one Word in relation to what he had determined to do to *Nabal.* Whilſt *Nabal*, who had vaſt Riches, was ſhearing his Sheep, *David* ſent to beg of him ſome Gratuity, in a very obliging manner. The Meſſengers did not fail to tell him, that his Shepherds had never been injured by *David*'s People. *Nabal*, being very churliſh, asked, rudely, who *David* was, and upbraided him with having ſhaken off his Maſter's Yoak. In a Word, he declared he was not ſo imprudent as to give to Strangers and Vagabonds, what he had provided for his own Servants. *David*, enraged at this Anſwer, ordered Four hundred of his Men to arm, and put himſelf at their Head, being firmly reſolved not to ſave a Soul alive, but to ſlay them all with the Sword. He even bound himſelf to it by an Oath, and if he did not execute this bloody Reſolution, it was owing to *Abigail*, who came to pacify him with Preſents and fair Words (11). *Abigail* was *Nabal*'s Wife, a Woman of great Merit, handſome, witty, and ſo agreeable to *David*, that he married her after her Husband's Death (12). Now let us deal plainly: Is it not manifeſt, beyond Contradiction, that *David* was about to do a very criminal Action? He had no right to the Goods of *Nabal*, nor any Authority to puniſh him for his Incivility. He was roving up and down the World with a Gang of truſty Friends: He might, indeed, have asked ſome Gratuity of thoſe who could afford it; but if they refuſed, he ought to have taken it patiently, and he could not compel them to it by Military Execution, without plunging the World again into the dreadful Confuſion, which they call the State of Nature, where no Law obtained but that of the ſtronger. What would one ſay now of a Prince of the Blood of *France*, who, being out of Favour at Court, ſhould make his Eſcape, with ſuch Friends as would be willing to ſhare his Fortune? What Opinion, I ſay, could we entertain of him, if he went about raiſing Contributions in the Countries where he cantoned, and put to the Sword, in thoſe Diſtricts, all that refuſed to pay his Taxes? What would we ſay, if this Prince ſhould fit out ſome Veſſels to inſeſt the Seas, in order to ſeize all the Merchant-Ships he could lay hold of? In truth, had *David* any more right to exact Contributions of *Nabal*, to maſſacre all the Men and Women in the Country of the *Amalekites*, &c. and to carry away all the Cattle he found there? If one ſhould anſwer, that the Law of Nations, the *Jus Belli & Pacis*, about which ſo many fine Syſtems have been made, are now better known than formerly: and, therefore, ſuch a Conduct was more excuſeable, in thoſe Days, than now. I grant it; but, at the ſame time, the profound Reſpect we ought to have for this great Prince, this great Prophet, ſhould not hinder us from diſapproving the Blemiſhes that occur in his Life: otherwiſe we ſhall give occaſion to Libertines to reproach us, and ſay, that, to determine an Action juſt, it is ſufficient that it ſhould be done by certain Perſons we reverence. Nothing can be more prejudicial to Chriſtian Morality. It is of great Importance to the true Religion, that the Lives of the Orthodox be judged by the general Notions of Juſtice and Order.

(11) 1 Sam. chap. xxv.

(12) Ib. ver. 42.

[*E*] *Had he obtained his Deſire, he would have fought againſt the* Iſraelites.] Whilſt *David*, with his little flying Camp, was employed in ravaging the Countries of the Infidels, wherever he could penetrate, the *Philiſtines* were preparing for War againſt the *Iſraelites*. They gathered all their Forces together. *David*, and his bold Adventurers, joined the Army of *Achiſh*, and would have fought like Lions againſt their Brethren, if the jealous *Philiſtines* had not obliged *Achiſh* to diſmiſs them. They were afraid that *David*, and his Men, in the Heat of Battle, would fall upon them, in order to make their Peace with *Saul*. When *David* underſtood that he muſt quit the Army becauſe of theſe Suſpicions, he was extremly concerned (13). He had a Mind, then, to contribute, with all his Might, to the Victory of the uncircumciſed *Philiſtines* over his own Brethren, the People of GOD, the Profeſſors of the true Religion. I leave it to nice Caſuiſts to determine, whether or no theſe Sentiments became a true *Iſraelite.*

(13) And *David* ſaid unto *Achiſh*, But what have I done? and what haſt thou found in thy ſervant, ſo long as I have been with thee unto this day, that I may not go fight againſt the enemies of my Lord the King? 1 *Sam. chap. xxix, ver.* 8.

[*F*] *His Reign was not diſturbed, but by the wicked Attempts of his own Children.*] The moſt remarkable of their wicked Attempts, was the Revolt of *Abſalom*, who forced this great Prince to fly from *Jeruſalem* in a mournful Condition. He went with his Head covered, bear-footed, melting in Tears, and his Ears filled with the Lamentations of his faithful Subjects (14). *Abſalom* entered *Jeruſalem* as in Triumph; and, that his Party might not abate of their Zeal, from a Notion that this Difference between Father and Son would be made up, he did one thing ſufficient to make them believe he ſhould never be reconciled to *David*. He lay with the ten Concubines of This Prince, in the ſight of every body (15). It is very likely, this Crime would have been forgiven: the extreme Affliction, into which his Death threw *David*, is a Proof of it. *David* was the beſt Father that ever lived: his Indulgence to his Children was exceſſive, and he himſelf was the firſt that ſuffered for it. For, had he puniſhed the infamous Action of his Son *Amnon*, as it deſerved (16), he would not have had the Shame and Sorrow to ſee another revenge the Injury done to *Tamar:* and had he chaſtized, as he ought, the Perſon who revenged this Injury, he would not have run the hazzard of being entirely dethroned. *David* had the Fate of

(14) 2 Sam. chap. xv.

(15) Ibid. chap. xvi.

(16) He raviſhed *Tamar*, and was killed for this Crime by the Order of *Abſalom*, who was *Tamar*'s own Brother, both by Father and Mother. *Ibid. chap. xiii.*

duced to the low Condition, in which *Samuel* found him. Humanly ſpeaking, this Reverſe of Fortune would have been unavoidable [G], if he had not found ſome Perſons about his Son *Abſalom*, who acted the Part of Traitors (y). *David*'s Piety is ſo conſpicuous in *Pſalms*, and in many of his Actions, that we cannot ſufficiently admire it. But there is another thing no leſs wonderful in his Conduct, *viz.* that he knew ſo happily how to reconcile ſo much Piety with the looſe Maxims of the Art of Governing. It is generally believed, that his Adultery with *Bathſheba*, the Murder of *Uriah*, and the Numbering of the People, are the only Faults he can be charged with. But it is a great Miſtake. There are many other things in his Life that deſerve Cenſure [H]. He is a Sun of Holineſs in the Church: he there diffuſes, by his Writings, a fruitful Light of Conſolation

(y) Ibid. chap. xv, ver. 34, &c.

of the moſt part of great Princes: he was unfortunate in his own Family. His eldeſt Son raviſhed his own Siſter, and was killed by one of his Brothers for that Inceſt: the Author of this Fratricide lay with the Concubines of *David*. What Scandal is here given to pious Souls, to ſee ſo much Infamy in the Family of this King!

[G] *He was very near being reduced to the Condition —— in which* Samuel *found him —— this reverſe of Fortune was unavoidable.*] We may ſee by this Example, that there is no depending upon the Fidelity of the People; for, in ſhort, *David* was both a great and good King. He was beloved, he was eſteemed, and had all imaginable Zeal for the Religion of his Country. His Subjects, therefore, had reaſon to be ſatisfied, and if they had been to chuſe a Prince, could they have wiſhed him better qualified? Nevertheleſs, they were ſo unſteady in their Duty to *David*, that his Son *Abſalom*, in order to get himſelf declared King, needed only to make himſelf popular for ſome time, and keep ſome Emiſſaries in each Tribe. This Maxim, *Caſta eſt quam nemo rogavit, —— She is a chaſte Woman that has never been ſollicited*, may very well be applied to the People. The reaſon we do not ſee Princes oftener dethroned, is, becauſe the People have not been ſollicited to revolt by Intrigues well enough managed. Nothing elſe is neceſſary: if the Prince be not wicked, it is they know how to make him paſs for ſuch, or for a Slave to wicked Counſel. Pretences are never wanting, and provided they be artfully ſupported, they paſs for a juſt Reaſon, how weak ſoever they are in themſelves.

[H] *It is generally believed, that his Adultery*, &c. *are the only Faults he can be charged with. —— There are many other things in his Life that deſerve cenſure.*] I have already taken notice of ſome of them, which happened while he was a private Perſon: here are others which relate to the time of his Reign.

I. His Polygamy cannot well be excuſed: for, tho' GOD permitted it in thoſe Days, we muſt not think one might ſtretch it very far, without indulging too much to Senſuality. *Michal*, the ſecond Daughter of *Saul*, was *David*'s firſt Wife: She was taken from him during his Diſgrace (17); he married ſucceſſively ſeveral others (18), and ſtill continued to demand back the firſt. Before ſhe could be reſtored to him, ſhe muſt be forced from a Husband that loved her exceedingly, and who followed her as far as he could, crying like a Child (19). *David* did not ſcruple to match with a Daughter of an uncircumciſed Prince (20): and tho' he had Children by ſeveral Wives, yet he took Concubines at *Jeruſalem*. Undoubtedly, he choſe the handſomeſt he could find: ſo we cannot ſay, with regard to the Pleaſures of Love, that he took much pains to mortify Nature.

(17) 1 Sam. chap xxv, ver. 44.

(18) 2 Sam. chap. iii, and v.

(19) Ibid. chap. iii, ver. 16.

(20) Talmai, *King of* Geſhur. Ibid. ver. 3.

II. When he heard of *Saul*'s Death, he bethought himſelf, without loſs of Time, how to ſecure the Succeſſion. He went to *Hebron, and as ſoon as he arrived there, the whole Tribe of* Judah, *whereof he had* GAINED THE CHIEF MEN BY PRESENTS, *owned him for King* (21). If *Abner* had not preſerved the reſt of the Succeſſion for the Son of *Saul*, doubtleſs, by the ſame Method, I mean the *gaining the chief Men by Preſents*, *David* would have been King of all *Iſrael*. But what happened after *Abner* by his Fidelity had kept eleven entire Tribes for *Iſhboſheth?* the very ſame thing that would happen between two infidel and moſt ambitious Kings. *David* and *Iſhboſheth*, made continual War upon each other (22), to ſee which of the two ſhould get the other's Portion, in order to enjoy the whole Kingdom without Diviſion. What I am going to ſay is much worſe. *Abner*, diſpleaſed with the King his Maſter, contrives to ſtrip him of his Dominions, and to deliver them up to *David*: He communicates his Deſign to *David*: He goes to him himſelf to concert with him the means of bringing it about. *David* lends an Ear to this treacherous Villain, and is well pleaſed to get a Kingdom by Intrigues of this nature (23). Can it be ſaid theſe are the Actions of a Saint? I own there is nothing in them but what is agreeable to the Maxims of Policy, and the Ways of human Prudence; but it can never be proved, that the ſtrict Laws of Equity, and rigid Morals of a faithful Servant of GOD, can allow of this Conduct. It is to be obſerved, *David* did not pretend that the Son of *Saul* reigned by Uſurpation; he granted he was a righteous Man (24), and conſequently a lawful King.

(21) *Hiſtoire de la Vie de David par l'Abbé de Choiſi*, pag. 47.

(22) 2 Sam. chap. iii, ver. 1.

(23) Ibid. chap. iii.

(24) Ibid. chap. iv, ver. 11.

III. I am of the ſame Mind, as to the Cunning *David* made uſe of, during *Abſalom*'s Revolt. He would not ſuffer *Huſhai*, one of his beſt Friends, to accompany him; he ordered him to go over to the Party of *Abſalom*, that he might give bad Counſels to this rebellious Son, and be able to inform *David* of all the Deſigns of the new King (25). This Cunning, without doubt, is very commendable, if we judge of things according to human Prudence, and the Policy of Princes. It ſaved *David*, and from that Age, even to our own incluſively, has produced a Multitude of Adventures, beneficial to ſome and deſtructive to others; but a rigid Caſuiſt will never take this Cunning for an Action worthy of a Prophet, a Saint, a righteous Man. A good Man, as ſuch, will rather loſe a Crown, than be the Cauſe of his Friend's Damnation: now, it is to damn our Friend, as much as in us lies, to puſh him on to commit a Crime; and it is a crime to pretend, with Zeal, to eſpouſe the Party of a man: to pretend it, I ſay, with a view to ruin that man, by giving him bad Counſels, and diſcovering all the Secrets of his Cabinet. Is it poſſible for one to act a more treacherous part than *Huſhai* did? As ſoon as he perceives *Abſalom*, he cries out *God ſave the King, God ſave the King*; and when he was asked, how he came to be ſo ungrateful, as not to accompany his intimate Friend, he gives himſelf devout Airs, and alledges reaſons of conſcience, *His will I be*, ſays he, *whom the Lord hath choſen* (26).

(25) Ib. ch. xv.

(26) Ibid. chap. xvi, ver. 18.

IV. When *David*, by reaſon of old age, could not be warmed by all the cloaths they covered him with, it was thought proper to ſeek for a young virgin, who might take care of and lie with him. He ſuffered them to bring to him for this purpoſe, the moſt beautiful girl they could find (27). Now, can this be ſaid to be the action of a very chaſt man? Will a man who is filled with the Ideas of Purity, and intirely reſolved to do what Order and good Morals require of him, ever conſent to theſe remedies? Is it poſſible to conſent to them without preferring the inſtincts of Nature, and the intereſts of the fleſh to thoſe of the Spirit of God?

(27) 1 Kings, chap. i.

V. *David* has been blamed long ſince, for having committed a flagrant piece of Injuſtice againſt *Mephibaſheth*, the Son of his dear Friend *Jonathan*. The fact is, *David* no longer fearing the Faction of King *Saul*, was pleaſed to ſhew himſelf liberal to all thoſe who might ſtill remain of that Family. He heard, that a poor lame man called *Mephibaſheth*, the Son of *Jonathan*, was yet alive; he ſent for him, and gave him all the Land that had belonged to King *Saul*, and commanded *Ziba*, an old Servant of that Family, to improve it for him, and for the Maintenance of *Mephibaſheth*'s Son: as to *Mephibaſheth* himſelf, he was to eat as long as he lived at King *David*'s Table (28). When this Prince made his eſcape from *Jeruſalem*, that he might not fall into the hands of *Abſalom*, he met *Ziba*, who brought him ſome Proviſions, and told him in one word, that *Mephibaſheth* ſtaid at *Jeruſalem*, in hopes of recovering the Kingdom amidſt theſe Revolutions. Upon which, *David* gave him all that belonged to *Mephibaſheth* (29). After the death of *Abſalom*,

(28) 2 Sam. chap. ix.

(29) Ib. ch. xvi.

ſolation and Piety, which cannot be enough admired; but that Sun had it's Spots, and even in his dying Words we find the Obliquities of Politics [*I*]. The Holy Scripture relates *ſalom*, he found *Ziba* had been a falſe Accuſer, and yet took from him but the half of what he had given him, and reſtored to *Mephibоſheth* only the half of his Eſtate. Some Authors pretend that this Injuſtice, which was ſo much the greater as *David* had been infinitely obliged to *Jonathan*, was the reaſon God permitted *Jeroboam* to rend in two the Kingdom of *Iſrael* (30). But it is certain, the Sins of *Solomon* were the Cauſe that God permitted this Diviſion (31). All the Interpreters have not left *David* without Apology. Some pretend, that *Ziba*'s Accuſation was not unjuſt, or at leaſt it was grounded upon ſo much probability, that one might give credit to it without being guilty of a raſh Judgment (32). But there are not many of this Opinion. Moſt of the Fathers and Moderns believe, that *Ziba* was a Slanderer, and that *David* ſuffered himſelf to be impoſed on. The Opinion of Pope *Gregory* is to be taken particular notice of: he owns *Mephibоſheth* was falſly accuſed, and yet pretends that the Sentence which deprived him of all his Eſtate was juſt. This he maintains for two Reaſons: Firſt, becauſe *David* pronounced it; ſecondly, becauſe a ſecret Judgment of God interpoſed in it. ‘ Non me ‘ latet, præter Interpretes in contrarium ſupra adductos, ‘ S. Gregorium contra Davidem ſtare lib. 1, Dialo. ‘ c. 4. Quamvis enim ait, latam a Davide contra inno- ‘ centem Jonathæ filium ſententiam, quia per Davidem ‘ lata eſt, & occulto Dei judicio pronunciata, juſtam ‘ credi, tamen diſertè agnoſcit Mephibоſethum fuiſſe ‘ innocentem. Ex quo aperte ſequitur ſententiam Da- ‘ vidis non fuiſſe juſtam. In quo cogimur S Gregorio ‘ non adhærere; cum compertiſſima ſit Davidis ſanctitas; nec eum poſtea farciſſe hujuſmodi diſpendium ‘ aliunde conſtet (33).——*Beſides the Interpreters above ‘ quoted for the contrary Opinion, I know St Gregory is ‘ againſt David l.* 1. *dialog. cap.* 4. *For tho' he ſays, the ‘ Sentence of David againſt the innocent Son of Jonathan ‘ is believed to be juſt, becauſe it was paſſed by David, ‘ and pronounced by the ſecret Judgment of God, yet he ‘ expreſsly acknowledges that Mephibоſheth was inno- ‘ cent. From whence it evidently follows, that the Sen- ‘ tence of David was not juſt. In which I am forced to ‘ differ from S. Gregory; ſince the Holineſs of David is ‘ very well known, and it does not appear that he after- ‘ wards repaired this Injury.* The Author I quote goes another way to work; ſince the Holineſs of *David*, ſays he, is very well known, and ſince he never ordered that Satisfaction ſhould be made for the wrong done to *Mephibоſheth*, we muſt conclude the Sentence was juſt. This is to eſtabliſh a very dangerous Principle: one would be no longer at liberty to examine by the Notions of Morality the Actions of the ancient Prophets, in order to condemn thoſe which are not conformable thereto; and ſo, Libertines might accuſe our Caſuiſts of approving certain Actions, which are manifeſtly unjuſt: of approving them, I ſay, in favour of ſome Men, and thro' reſpect of Perſons. Let us ſay rather, and apply to the Saints what has been ſaid of great Wits, *Nullum ſine venia placuit ingenium.* The greateſt Saints have ſometimes need of a Pardon.

VI. I ſhall ſay nothing of what *Michal*, one of *David*'s Wives, reproached him with, in regard to the Figure he made when he danced in public. If he had uncovered his Nakedneſs, the Action might paſs for an ill one, morally ſpeaking: but if he only made himſelf contemptible by his Poſtures, and by not ſupporting the Dignity of his Character, it was at moſt but an imprudence, and not a crime. We muſt conſider well upon what occaſion he danced: it was when the Ark was brought up to *Jeruſalem* (34); and conſequently the exceſs of his Joy, and of his Capers, teſtified his Attachment and Senſibility for holy things. A modern Author has endeavoured to juſtify the Nakedneſs of *Francis of Aſſiſe* by that of *David*: *Michal, David's wife*, ſays he (35), *having ſeen from a window her huſband, who, being tranſported with an holy fervour, leaped and danced before the Ark of the Lord, deſpiſed him in her heart, and, rallying him, ſaid,* How glorious was the King of Iſraël to day, who uncovered himſelf in the eyes of the handmaids of his ſervants, as one of the vain fellows ſhamelеſsly uncovereth himſelf! *Theſe laſt words of the Holy Text ſeem to intimate that David ſtripped himſelf ſtark naked; however, as the ſame text* (ver. 14.), *ſpeaking of David's dance before the Ark, ſays he was girded with a linnen ephod, I do not think he was quite naked. But he uncovered himſelf ſo much, that he ſeemed to be naked, and that it was thought unbecoming the Gravity and Majeſty of a King; eſpecially as it was done publickly and before a great multitude. The action of David, attended with all theſe Circumſtances, is not more juſtifiable than that of St Francis, who had very few Spectators* (36): *ſo that if the action of the one deſerves cenſure, that of the other cannot be exempted from it; and indeed we read that Michal derided him for it. But let us ſee whether the Holy Spirit did ſo; and we ſhall judge by that whether we ought to ridicule the action of St Francis.* Afterwards he relates the Anſwer *David* made to *Michal*, and what the Scripture obſerves concerning her Barrenneſs. A great many Ladies would deſerve to be barren, if the having *Michal*'s Taſte were a ſufficient reaſon for it. It would be thought very ſtrange all over *Europe*, if, upon a Day of Proceſſion of the Holy Sacrament, Kings ſhould dance in the Streets without any thing but a little Saſh round the waiſt.

VII. The Conqueſts of *David* ſhall be the ſubject of my laſt Obſervation. There are ſome rigid Caſuiſts, who do not think a Chriſtian Prince can lawfully engage in a War, thro' a Deſire only of aggrandizing himſelf. Theſe Caſuiſts approve of no Wars but thoſe that are defenſive, or in general ſuch as tend only to reſtore to every one his own. At this rate, *David* had frequently undertaken unjuſt Wars: for, beſides that the holy Scripture repreſents him pretty often as the Aggreſſor, we find he *extended the bounds of his empire from Egypt to the Euphrates* (37). That we may not then condemn *David*, it is better to ſay that Conqueſts may ſometimes be permitted; and therefore we ought to take care, leſt, in exclaiming againſt modern Princes, we ſhould inadvertently aſperſe this great Prophet.

But if, generally ſpeaking, the Conqueſts of this holy Monarch were glorious to him, without prejudice to his Juſtice, we can hardly agree they were ſo when we come to Particulars. Let us not by Conjectures rake into Secrets, which Hiſtory has not revealed: Let us not conclude, that becauſe *David* was pleaſed to make an Advantage of *Abner*'s and *Huſhai*'s Treachery, therefore he practiſed all manner of Cunning againſt the infidel Princes, whom he ſubdued. Let us confine ourſelves intirely to what the ſacred Hiſtory tells us of the way in which he treated the Conquered. *And he brought forth the people that were in* Rabbah (38), *and put them under ſaws, and under harrows of iron, and under axes of iron, and made them paſs through the brick-kiln: and thus he did unto all the cities of the children of Ammon* (39). The *Geneva* Bible obſerves in the Margin of this Verſe, *that theſe were kinds of capital Puniſhments uſed in former times.* Let us ſee how he treated the *Moabites*: *He meaſured them with a line caſting them down to the ground; even with two lines meaſured he, to put to death: and with one full line to keep alive* (40). That is, he had a mind to put to death exactly two thirds, neither more nor leſs (41). *Idumea* met with rougher Uſage; for there he ordered all the Males to be ſlain: *ſix months did Joab remain there with all Iſrael, until he had cut off every male in Edom* (42). Can one ſay, this way of making War is not to be condemned? Have not even the *Turks* and *Tartars* a little more Humanity? And if an infinite number of Pamphlets exclaim every day againſt the military Executions of our own time, which are indeed harſh, and much to be blamed, but gentle when compared with thoſe of *David*, what would the Authors of theſe Pamphlets ſay, if they had the Saws, the Harrows, the Brick-kilns of *David* to complain of, and the general Maſſacre of all Males, old and young?

[*I*] *And even in his dying Words we find the obliquities of Politics.*] Underſtand me right: I do not mean that *David* in this condition did not ſpeak according to his Mind: but that the plain and free manner, in which he opened his Heart, ſhews he had formerly, upon two remarkable Occaſions, ſacrificed Juſtice to Intereſt. He knew very well *Joab* deſerved Death, and to let the Murders, whereof he had been guilty, go unpuniſhed, was

(30) Id gravis peccati injuſtitiæ erga innoxium Mephibоſethum, damnant Abulenſis 2 Reg. 16, q. 6, &c. 10, q. 20, & Richelius, ac Cajetanus ibi: nec non Salianus anno mundi 3010, à n 21. & alii plerique anteriores, ut Lyranus Hugo, Rabanus, aliique: quibus ob hanc injuſtitiam in Mephibоſethum, nexa cum infidelitate magna & ingratitudine in Jonathan ejus patrem, viſum eſt ſciſſum eſſe ſub Roboano Dividis regnum. Et ita videtur aſſeri apud Hieronymum in Tradit. Hebr. ad lib. 2, Reg. cap. 19. *Theoph. Raynaudus, Hoplot.* Sect. 2, Serie, 2, cap. x, pag. m. 231.

(31) 1 Kings, chap. xi, ver. 11.

(32) Vide Petrum Joannem Olivii apud Th Raynaud. Hopl. Sect. 4, chap. 3, pag. 523. & ipſum Raynaud. pag 232.

(33) Theoph. Raynaud. pag. 232.

(34) 2 Sam. chap. vi.

(35) Ferrand, Reponſe à l'Apologie pour la Reformation, pag. 364, 365.

(36) *Francis of Aſſiſe* being brought by his Father to the Biſhop to renounce his Patrimony, and give up every thing he had, he delivered to his Father his very Cloaths, and ſtripped himſelf ſtark naked before the Company. The Biſhop roſe from his Seat, and covered him with his Cloak. *Bonaventure, Life of St Francis*, quoted by *Ferrand, Reponſe à l'Apologie pour la Reformation, pag.* 363, 364.

(37) L'Abbé de Choiſi, Hiſtoire de la Vie de David, pag. 64.

(38) This was the chief City of the *Ammonites.*

(39) 2 Sam. ch. xii, ver. 31.

(40) Ibid. chap. viii, ver. 2.

(41) *See the Note of the* Geneva *Bible.*

(42) 1 Kings, chap. xi, ver. 15.

lates them only hiſtorically, and therefore every one is at liberty to paſs a Judgment upon them (z). Let us conclude with ſaying, that the Hiſtory of *David* may comfort many crowned Heads againſt the Alarms, which rigid Caſuiſts may give them, in maintaining, that it is hardly poſſible for a King to be ſaved. The Life of that great Prince, publiſhed by the Abbot *de Choiſi*, is a good Book, and would be much more uſeful, if he had taken the Pains to ſet down in the Margin the Year of each Fact, and the Places of the Bible, or *Joſephus*, upon which he grounds his Aſſertions. A Reader would be glad to know, whether what he reads flows from a ſacred or prophane Source. I ſhall not obſerve many Faults in *Moreri* [*K*]. The Article

(z) *See Remark [I] towards the end.*

was a manifeſt injuſtice againſt Law and Reaſon. Nevertheleſs, *Joab* had kept his Poſts, his Credit, and Authority. He was a brave Man; he ſerved the King his Maſter faithfully, and to good purpoſe: and there was reaſon to fear ſome mutiny, if they had attempted to puniſh him. Theſe were political Reaſons, which made the Laws give place to Advantage. But, when *David* had no further Occaſion for this General, he ordered him to be put to Death: This was one of the Articles of his laſt Will (43). *Solomon* his Succeſſor was charged with the like order againſt *Shimei*. This Man, knowing *David* had made his eſcape from *Jeruſalem* in great diſorder, upon the account of *Abſalom*'s Revolt, came to inſult him by the way, and uſed reproaches yet harder than the Stones he threw at him (44). *David* bore this injury very patiently; he acknowledged and adored the Hand of GOD in it, with marks of ſingular Piety; and when his Affairs were re-eſtabliſhed, he pardoned *Shimei*, who was one of the firſt that came to ſubmit themſelves, and implore his Mercy (45). *David* ſwore to him he would not put him to Death, and kept his Word to his Death-bed; but finding himſelf in this condition, he gave a charge to his Son to kill him (46); a plain Proof that he ſuffered him to live only to get himſelf at firſt the Name of a merciful Prince, and afterwards to avoid being reproached to his Face for having broken his promiſe. I ſhould be glad to know, whether, in ſtrictneſs of Speech, a Man, who promiſes Life to his Enemy, performs his promiſe, when by his laſt Will he orders him to be put to Death.

(43) 1 Kings, chap. ii, ver. 6.

(44) 2 Sam. chap. xvi, ver. 5, &c.

(45) Ibid. chap. xix, ver. 19, &c.

(46) 1 Kings, chap. ii, ver. 9.

From what I have ſaid, in this and the foregoing Remarks, it may be eaſily inferred, that if the *Syrians* had been ſuch Libel-Makers, as the *Europeans* are now adays, they would have ſtrangely diſfigured the glory of *David*. With what Epithets, with what infamous Names would they have branded that Troop of Banditti, that came to join him, after he retired from the Court of *Saul*? The Scripture informs us, that all thoſe who were perſecuted by their Creditors, all Malecontents, and all thoſe who were in Diſtreſs, gathered themſelves unto him, and he became their Captain (47). Nothing can be liable to a worſe Conſtruction than this. The Hiſtorians of *Catiline* and *Cæſar* would furniſh Colours enough for a ſatirical Picture. Hiſtory has preſerved a ſmall Specimen of the reproaches, to which *David* was expoſed among *Saul*'s Friends. This Specimen ſhews they accuſed him of being a Man of Blood, and that they conſidered the revolt of *Abſalom*, as a juſt Puniſhment for the Miſchief, which they ſaid he had done to *Saul*, and to all his Houſe. I put the Words of Scripture in the Margin (48): and here follow thoſe of *Joſephus* (49): Δαβίδη δὲ γενομένῳ κατὰ χώραμον ἔτω καλέμενον τόπον ἐπέρχεται τῦ Σαύλε συγγενὴς ὄνομα Σεμεεὶ - - - - - καὶ λίθοις τε ἔβαλεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκακηγόρει. φίλων καὶ σκεπόντων ἔτι μᾶλλον βλασφημῶν διε[έλει, μιαιφόνον καὶ πολλῶν ἀρχηγὸν κακῶν ἀποκαλῶν· ἐκέλευε δὲ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὡς ἐναγῆ καὶ ἐπάρατον ἐξεῖναι, καὶ τῷ Θεῷ χάειν ἔχειν ὡμολογεῖ τῆς βασιλείας αὐ[ὸν ἀφελομένω, καὶ διὰ παιδὸς ἰδίε τὴν ὑπὲρ ὧν ἠμαρ[εν εἰς δεσπό[ην δίκην αυτῷ εἰσπεξαμένῳ. Davidi verò juxta locum Bachoram ſupervenit cognatus Sauli nomine Semeis .... faxis eum ſimul & convitiis impetens, cumque amici eum protegerent, magis etiam exaſperatus ad convitia ſanguinarium & multorum malorum cauſam appellabat, jubens ut impurus ac execrabilis regione excederet; gratiaſque agebat Deo quod per proprium filium pœnam peccatorum ab illo exigeret, & eorum quæ olim in dominum ſuum commiſerat. —— *But a Kinſman of* Saul, *whoſe Name was* Shimei, *came out upon* David *near* Bahurim, ... *falling upon him at once with Stones and Curſes; and as his Friends protected him, the more he reviled him, calling him a bloody Man, and the Author of much miſchief, and thanked* GOD *for taking the Kingdom from him, and for making his own Son the Inſtrument of his Puniſhment, becauſe of thoſe things he had done againſt his Maſter.* But they exaggerated Matters: It is true, *David* according to the Teſtimony of GOD himſelf was a Man of Blood; and therefore GOD would not permit him to build the Temple (50). It is true likewiſe, that, to pacify the *Gibeonites*, he delivered to them two Sons, and five Grandſons of *Saul*, who were all ſeven hanged (51). But it is falſe, that he ever made an attempt, either upon the Life or the Crown of *Saul*.

(47) 1 Sam. ch. xxii, ver. 2.

(48) *The Words of* Shimei, *according to the Scripture, are theſe:* Come out, come out, thou bloody man, and thou man of *Belial:* the Lord hath returned upon thee all the Blood of the Houſe of *Saul*, in whoſe ſtead thou haſt reigned, and the Lord hath delivered the kingdom into the hands of *Abſalom* thy ſon, and behold thou art taken in thy miſchief, becauſe thou art a bloody man. 2 *Sam. chap. xvi, ver.* 7, 8.

(49) Antiq. lib. 7, chap. 8, pag. 230.

(50) 1 Chron. chap xxii, ver. 8, and ch. xxviii, ver 3.

(51) 2 Sam. chap. xxi, ver. 6.

Thoſe, who ſhall think it ſtrange that I ſpeak my Mind about ſome Actions of *David*, compared with natural Morality, are deſired to conſider three Things: I. They themſelves are obliged to own, that the conduct of this Prince towards *Uriah*, is one of the greateſt Crimes which can be committed. There is then only a difference of more to leſs between them and me: For, I agree with them, that the other Faults of this Prophet did not hinder his being filled with Piety, and a great Zeal for the glory of GOD. He was ſubject alternately to Paſſions and Grace. This is a Misfortune attending our Nature ſince the Fall of *Adam*. The Grace of GOD very often directed him: but on ſeveral Occaſions Paſſion got the better: Policy ſilenced Religion. II. It is very allowable for private Perſons, like me, to judge of Facts contained in Scripture, when they are not expreſsly characterized by the holy Spirit. If the Scripture in relating an Action condemns or praiſes it, none can appeal from this judgment: every one ought to regulate his Approbation or Cenſure upon the Model of Scripture. I have not acted contrary to this Rule: the Facts, upon which I have advanced my humble Opinion, are related in the holy Scripture, without any mark of Approbation affixed by the Spirit of GOD (52). III. It would be doing an injury to the Eternal Laws, and conſequently to the true Religion, to give Libertines Occaſion to object, that when a Man has been once inſpired by GOD, we look upon his Conduct as the Rule of Manners; ſo that we ſhould not dare to condemn the Actions of People, though moſt oppoſite to the notions of Equity, when ſuch an one has done them. There is no Medium in this Caſe; either theſe Actions are not good, or Actions like them are not evil: now, ſince we muſt chuſe either the one or the other, is it not better to take care of the Intereſts of Morality, than the glory of a private Perſon? Otherwiſe, will it not be evident, that one chuſes rather to expoſe the Honour of GOD than that of a mortal Man?

An important Advice upon what has been ſaid above.

(52) I have obſerved, the Scripture informs us, that *David* conſulted and followed the Orders of God, when he was to repel the Aggreſſors, 1 *Sam. chap. xxiii and xxx*; but that he did not conſult God, when he intended to deſtroy *Nabal*, nor when he was going to deſtroy the Neighbours of King *Achiſh*, and made him believe he ravaged the Dominions of *Saul*: This is a Sign God did not approve ſuch kind of Actions.

[*K*] *I ſhall not obſerve many Faults in* Moreri.] Only five.

I. *David* was Twenty two Years of Age, when *Samuel anointed him with the Oil deſigned for the Conſecration of Kings*. This is inconſiſtent with what follows, and with what goes before. That Author had been ſaying that *David* was born in the Year of the World 2950; and a little while after he tells us, that *David* conquered *Goliah* in the Year of the World 2971. It is plain, that the Victory over *Goliah* was obtained after the Anointing of *David*; whereas, according to *Moreri*, the Ceremony of the Unction was not performed till a Year after that Victory. To mend this Fault, it muſt be ſaid, that *David* received the Unction at twenty Years of Age (53). The reſt needs no correction; for it is true that *David* conquered *Goliah* the Year after his Unction.

(53) According to *Calviſius*, he was born in the Year of the World 2860, and anointed by *Samuel* in the Year of the World 2880, and he killed *Goliah* the Year after.

II. It is not true that *Saul* renewed his Perſecution againſt *David*, when the latter had twice abſtained from doing him the leaſt Harm, having the moſt favourable Opportunity in the World for it. It is ſomewhat ſurpriſing, that the Scripture, in order to aggravate *Saul*'s Crime, does not obſerve that he ſoon repented of his Reconciliation with *David*, and that he made himſelf guilty of a black Ingratitude. In the

Twenty

Article of *David*, which I have juſt read in the Dictionary of the Bible, will ſupply me with Matter enough for a Remark [*L*]. I forgot to obſerve, that *David* ought not to be

Twenty fourth Chapter of the Firſt Book of *Samuel*, he is informed, that *David*, having it in his Power to kill him in a Cave, would do him no kind of Harm: he admires that Generoſity; he deſires GOD to reward it; he acknowledges that the Crown is deſigned for *David*; he recommends his Family to him, and returns to his Houſe. In the Twenty ſixth Chapter of the ſame Book, he hears, that *David*, having it in his Power to kill him in the Night in his Tent, goes away without doing him any harm; he admires that Generoſity; he gives *David* his Bleſſing; he foretels him all manner of Proſperity, and goes Home. *Moreri* pretends that theſe two things, ſo like one another, happened in one Year. I repeat it again. It is ſomewhat ſurpriſing, that the Scripture does not make uſe of the firſt of thoſe two Facts, to make *Saul*'s Obſtinacy in perſecuting his Son-in-law more odious. Two or three lines would have had a great effect: The Reader would have been ſhocked to ſee that *Saul*, indebted to his Son in-law for his Life, praiſes him, admires him, gives him a thouſand Bleſſings, and yet a little while after purſues him to deſtroy him. Doubtleſs the Laws of a Narration require, that, in ſpeaking of this new Purſuit, it ſhould be obſerved, that it was a Violation of that ſolemn Agreement that followed the Adventure of the Cave; and yet there is not one tittle in the Scripture concerning that Circumſtance. Here are other Subjects of ſurpriſe. *David*, repreſenting to *Saul* that he did not deſerve the Perſecution he ſuffered, and that he could have killed him in his Tent, did not repreſent that it was the ſecond time he had the King's Life in his Hands, and that the King had ſoon forgot what had happened in the Cave. *Saul* on his part, who owns himſelf in the wrong, and who ſpeaks to *David* in moſt obliging Terms, does not obſerve that it is the ſecond time that he owes his Life to him. It muſt be confeſſed that ſuch Circumſtances do not uſe to be forgotten. Moreover we ſee that, in the firſt of thoſe two Adventures, *David* and *Saul* uſe almoſt the ſame Words as in the ſecond. If I ſaw two Narratives of this Nature either in *Ælian*, or in *Valerius Maximus*, I ſhould make no difficulty to believe that it is one and the ſame Fact, which having been reported two different ways, ſerved for the Subject of two Articles, or of two Chapters. The Fact would be this: *David*, having *Saul*'s Life in his Hands, who was his cruel Perſecutor, did carefully preſerve it. The two ways of relating it, would be, I. That *Saul*, being obliged by a natural neceſſity to go aſide from his Men, went into a Cave where *David* was. II. That *David* ſlipt in the Night into *Saul*'s Tent, the Guards being in a deep Sleep. I leave it to Father *Simon*, and the Critics of his Rank, to examine whether it be poſſible, that the Hiſtorical Books of the Old Teſtament ſhould relate the ſame thing twice. It ſeems to me that the Action of the *Ziphites*, related in the Twenty third Chapter of the Firſt Book of *Samuel*, is not different from that which is related in the Twenty ſixth Chapter of the ſame Book. Whoever goes about to compare thoſe two Accounts, will doubtleſs be of my Opinion. What is very certain, is, that *Saul* did not perſecute *David* after the ſecond Reconciliation. This is *Moreri*'s ſecond Fault.

OBSERVATIONS upon a Narration in the Books of *Samuel*.

The IIId conſiſts in his ſaying, that *David was ſo well received by* Achiſh, *King of* Gath, *that his new Favour was like to make the Grandees rebel*. There is not one Word of Truth in all this, and I ſee nothing that might occaſion that Falſity, but the Suſpicions that were entertained of *David*, when they ſaw him with his Men in the Rear of the Army of the *Philiſtines*. The Commanders would abſolutely have had him return into the City that was given him (54). There was a great Difference between thoſe Commanders, and the Grandees of the King of *Gath*'s Court.

(54) 1 Sam. chap. 29.

IV. The pretended Diſcontent of the Grandees did not oblige *David* to retire from that Court. But he retired out of Reſpect: he feared that he and his Men ſhould incommode the Prince by their Abode in the chief City: therefore he deſired *Achiſh* to aſſign him another Place to live in, which was granted him. This happened before the Commanders of the *Philiſtines* required that *David* ſhould march out of their Camp.

V. *Moreri* ſhould not have ſaid, that *David returned* to *Ziklag*, ſince he had not ſaid that he had already ſojourned there.

[*L*] *The Article of* DAVID *in the* Dictionary of the Bible *will ſupply me with Matter for a Remark.*] The Printers were come thus far, when a Dictionary was ſhewed me (55), which I conſulted immediately at the Article of the Prophet *David*, and I find ſome Paſſages in it that give me occaſion to make the following Obſervations. I. It is not true that *David* was born One hundred and ten Years before the Birth of JESUS CHRIST: there is above One thouſand Years (56) between the Birth of the one and the Birth of the other. II. He ought not to have ſuppreſſed the Incurſions made by *David* on the Allies of his Patron, nor the Lye he made uſe of, in perſuading King *Achiſh*, that he made them on the Lands of the *Iſraelites*. Neither ought he to have ſuppreſſed the unjuſt War he made on That People: he put to the Sword both Men and Women. It is not allowable, in a Dictionary, to imitate the Panegyriſts, who take only the fair ſide of a Character: The Author ſhould act the Hiſtorian; he ſhould relate both the Good and the Bad; it is what the Scripture has done. III. One cannot then approve the Affectation, which appears here, of ſaying nothing of *David*'s Artifices, both againſt *Iſhboſheth*, and againſt *Abſalom*, and of mentioning only the Wars, in which *David* was firſt attacked. Should not ſome notice have been taken of Thoſe, in which the Scripture repreſents him as the Aggreſſor, and of the aſtoniſhing Severity with which he treated the Vanquiſhed? IV. The Author does worſe than ſuppreſs; he ſuppoſes, without the Authority of the Scripture, that *the* Syrians, *the* Ammonites, *the* Moabites, *and the other neighbouring People, attacked* David. The ſacred Hiſtory plainly intimates, that they only endeavoured to defend themſelves, in which they failed of Succeſs (57). V. He ſuppoſes likewiſe, with as little Foundation in the Scripture, that this Prince married the young Girl, who was brought to him, to endeavour to keep him warm. I could excuſe him this, without injuring what I have ſaid concerning this fine Method of reviving the natural Heat. The leaſt rigid of our modern Caſuiſts, I believe, would not judge it fit that an old Man, utterly incapable of conſummating the Marriage, ſhould wed a young Girl, with the ſole view of warming his Feet and Hands by her Side. Without doubt, they would think him guilty of a Sin, and that he would cauſe his Conſort to ſin likewiſe. VI. The Author ſtrives to remove the Difficulty that is obvious to all Readers, when they conſider that *Saul* did not know *David* on the Day that *Goliah* was killed; I ſay he ſtrives to remove it, and intangles himſelf more than he ſhould; for he ſays in one place (58), that *David*, being ſeventeen Years of Age, went to play on the Harp before *Saul*; and, in another (59), he gives him but fourteen or fifteen Years, and the Stature of a *very little Boy*. A little after, going about to refute thoſe who ſay, that the Fight with *Goliah* preceeded the *playing on the Harp*, he raiſes a ſpecious Objection againſt himſelf, grounded on this, *viz.* That thoſe who propoſed *David* as a fit Perſon to drive away, with his Muſic, the evil ſpirit that afflicted *Saul*, gave him the Character of a valiant Man and a good Warrior (60). *I anſwer*, ſays he, *that it ought not to be concluded from theſe two words*, Fortiſſimum & Bellicoſum, *that the Fight was before the playing on the Harp, ſince the Name of ſtrong may be given to any one that is truly ſo according to his Age. Is it not a ſign of great Strength to purſue Bears and Lions, and to fight with and choak them?* This Anſwer ſuppoſes that *David* being, as yet *very little, and a Youth of fourteen or fifteen Years of Age*, fought with Lions, took them running, and ſtrangled them, and might be called a ſtrong Man, a Warrior, and a Man that ſpoke well. This Difficulty is great enough to deſerve to be ſolved; how comes it then that our Author does not ſeem to have the leaſt glimpſe of it? Notwithſtanding his Silence, the diſcerning Readers will eaſily perceive, that ſince *David* fought with *Goliah* at the Age of twenty one Years (61), he muſt have been near twenty Years of Age the firſt time he went to *Saul*'s Court. And thus the Reaſon

(55) It is the *Dictionary of the Bible* compoſed by Mr *Simon*, Prieſt, and Doctor of Divinity, and printed at *Lyons*, 1693, in *folio*.

(56) 1090, *according to* Calviſius.

(57) 1 Kings, chap. i.

(58) Pag. 249.

(59) Pag. 259.

(60) Et reſpondens unus de pueris ait, ecce vidi filium Iſai Bethlemitem ſcientem pſallere, & fortiſſimum robore, virum bellicoſum, &c. *Ibid. pag.* 249.

(61) It is the Suppoſition of the Author of the Dictionary of the Bible, pag. 249.

be blamed for excluding his eldeſt Son from the Succeſſion [*M*].

Reaſon that our Author gives for the beſt, why *Saul* did not know *David* the Day he fought with *Goliah*, is inſignificant (61). That Reaſon is, that a little Boy alters ſo much in his Face in ſeven Years time, that thoſe who do not ſee him till after an Abſence of ſeven Years do not know him again. This is not *David*'s Caſe, and therefore ſome other Reaſons muſt be alledged. The Author mentions thoſe which ſeveral Commentators have imagined. If they do not fully ſatisfy thoſe, whom it is no eaſy thing to ſatisfy, it muſt be aſcribed to the nature of the Queſtion. VII. The Author forgets the ſtrongeſt Proof, that can be alledged, againſt thoſe who will have it that *David* was not ſent for to drive away the evil Spirit from *Saul*, till after his Fight with *Goliah*. He does not ſay that they confound the Order in which things are related in the Scripture; he does not ſay that *Saul*'s Servant, who praiſed *David* for being ſtrong, valiant, eloquent, and handſome, did not ſpeak of the Victory obtained over *Goliah*. Now it is impoſſible to apprehend that thoſe, who had a mind to recommend him to the King after that Combat, ſhould have been ſo ſtupid as not to tell the Prince, in a Word, *That ſame young Man, who killed* Goliah, *plays well upon Inſtruments, and he will cure you.*

(61) He quotes the Author of the Hiſtory of the Bible, who reckons eight Years between the firſt and the ſecond time that *Saul* ſaw *David*, and who ſuppoſes that *David* was but fifteen Years of Age the firſt time.

For fear of being too long, I ſhall not examine whether the Author has wanted Exactneſs in the reſt of the Article. He has avoided the Inconveniency which I have obſerved in the Abbot *de Choiſi*; for he ſets down the Years wherein *David* did ſuch and ſuch things.

[*M*] *He ought not to be blamed for excluding his eldeſt Son.*] *David* left his Kingdom to *Solomon*, in prejudice of the Right of Primogeniture; a right, which in hereditary Crowns ought to be inviolably preſerved, unleſs we would open a Door to a thouſand Civil-Wars. Nevertheleſs, *David* had very good Reaſons to ſet aſide this Right, ſince *Adonijah* his eldeſt Son had been ſo impatient to reign, that he mounted the Throne before *David*'s Breath was out of his Body (62). This good Father durſt not ſhew his reſentment againſt an Impatience, which in reality differed nothing from Uſurpation: he had always been very indulgent to his Children; and his almoſt decrepit age was not very proper to correct the eaſineſs which accompanies tender Hearts; but *Solomon*'s Mother, incited and directed by a Prophet (63), whom *Adonijah* had not invited to a Royal Feſtival (64), fruſtrated the Deſign: ſhe and the Prophet obliged *David* to declare himſelf in favour of *Solomon*, and to give all neceſſary Orders for the Inauguration of this young Prince. *Adonijah* thought he was undone, and fled for Refuge to the horns of the Altar; but *Solomon* aſſured him he would do him no hurt, provided he behaved himſelf well (65). However, he cauſed him to be put to Death, for a Reaſon that ſeems frivolous enough: I mean becauſe *Adonijah* had asked in Marriage the *Shunamite*, who had ſerved to cheriſh *David* (66). This confirms what I ſaid before, that this Royal Prophet was unfortunate in his Children. They had no natural affection, neither to him, nor one another. Here the wiſeſt of them all ſheds the Blood of his eldeſt Brother for a trifle: for, we muſt not imagine he would have put him to Death becauſe of the Irregularity of his Love. All the Sons of *David* ſhould have looked on the *Shunamite* as forbidden Fruit. Her Virginity had belonged to their Father; and he would actually have taken Poſſeſſion of it, had he been able. *Adonijah* was therefore to blame to caſt his Eyes upon this Girl; but it was not for this Reaſon his Brother killed him: it was becauſe his demand rouſed the Jealouſy of *Solomon*, and made him fear, that by the frequent practice of asking favours, he would ſoon bethink himſelf to make the beſt of his Birthright (67). A policy, in ſome reſpects, like that of the *Ottomans*, made him loſe his Life.

(62) 1 Kings, chap. i.

(63) *By the Prophet* Nathan.

(64) 1 Kings, chap. i, ver. 10, and 26.

(65) Ibid. ver. 51, 52.

(66) Ib. chap. ii.

(67) 1 Kings, chap. ii, ver. 22.

Some EXCEPTIONS *having been made by the Conſiſtory of the* Walloon *Church of* Rotterdam *to the preceeding Article of* DAVID, *as it was drawn up in the firſt Edition of this Dictionary*; *Mr* BAYLE, *in compliance to the Deſire of the Conſiſtory, left out, in the ſecond Edition, what he conceived had been diſagreeable, and printed it in the following manner.* (*We have inſerted both, as the ſame has been done in the ſubſequent Editions:* viz. *at* Geneva 1715, Rotterdam 1720, Amſterdam 1730, *and in* France 1734.)

DAVID, King of the *Jews*, was one of the greateſt Men in the World, even tho' we ſhould not conſider him as a Royal Prophet, who was after GOD's own Heart. The firſt time that the Scripture makes him appear on the Stage of the World (*a*), is to inform us that *Samuel* appointed him King, and performed the Ceremony of anointing him. *David* was then but a meer Shepherd. He was the youngeſt of the eight Sons of *Jeſſe* the *Bethlehemite* [*A*]. Afterwards the Scripture tells us, that he was ſent to King

(*a*) 1 Sam. xvi, 13.

[*A*] *He was the youngeſt of the Sons of* Jeſſe *the* Bethlehemite.] *Jeſſe* deſcended in a direct Line from *Judah*, one of the twelve Sons of *Jacob*, and dwelt at *Bethlehem*, a ſmall City of the Tribe of *Judah*. Some Modern *Rabbins* ſay, that, when *David* was conceived, his Father *Jeſſe* did not think that he lay with his Wife, but with his Servant Maid, and thereby explain the ſeventh verſe of the Fifty firſt Pſalm, wherein *David* affirms, that *he was ſhapen in Iniquity, and that his Mother conceived him in Sin.* This, ſay they, ſignifies that *his Father* Jeſſe *committed an Adultery in begetting him, becauſe, though he begot him on his Wife, he believed that he begot him on his Servant Maid, upon whoſe Chaſtity he had made an Attempt* (1). This Explication does not well agree with the Doctrine of Original Sin, and for that reaſon Father *Bartolocci* (2), having mentioned that Opinion of the Modern *Rabbins*, thought himſelf obliged to examine whether the ancient Jews acknowledged the Truth of that Doctrine. If the Suppoſition of thoſe *Rabbins* was true, they would be in the right to ſay, that *Jeſſe* had committed Adultery; but on the other ſide it muſt be ſaid, that he would not have been guilty of it, if, ſincerely believing that he was enjoying his Wife, he had got his Servant Maid with Child. This Rabbinical Suppoſition is very different from the Tradition mentioned by St *Jerom*. He ſays, that it was believed that *Jeſſe*, the Father of *David*, did never commit any actual Sin, and that there was no kind of Uncleanneſs in him but what he brought from his Mother's Womb. 'Mirum eſt quod de Iſai patre Davidis refert Hieronymus, illum nunquam aliud peccatum 'commiſiſſe quam quod ex origine contraxit. Quo 'enim loco legimus: *Amaſa* † *ingreſſus eſt ad Abigail* † Lib. ii, Reg. 17, 25. 'filiam Naas ſororem Sarviæ; ſic Hieronymus ‡, *Naas* 'interpretatur coluber, quia eum nullum admiſiſſe mor- 'tiferum perhibent peccatum, niſi quod originaliter de 'ſerpente antiquo contraxit. *Eſt autem Naas qui &* 'Iſai pater David. Eamdem traditionem refert Abu- 'lenſis ‡, & monet Naas eumdem eſſe qui & Jeſſe 'ſive Iſai patrem Davidis, quod quidem & antea Lira- 'nus * docuerat (3). —— *St* Jerom *relates ſomething* 'very ſingular of Jeſſe, *Father of* David, *that he never* 'was guilty of any Sin, except that which is called O- 'riginal. For when we read, that *Amaſa* went in to *A*- 'bigail, the Daughter of *Nahaſh*, Siſter to *Zeruiah*; 'Thus St Jerom interprets it: *Nahaſh* ſignifies a Ser- 'pent; for it is ſaid, that he never committed any 'deadly Sin, but what he originally contracted from 'the old Serpent, and *Nahaſh* is the ſame with *Jeſſe* 'David's

(1) *See the* Journal des Sçavans, July 14, 1692, pag. 405, Dutch Edit.

(2) In *Bibliotheca magna Rabbinica*, Part. II, pag. 4, apud *Journal des Sçavans*, ibid.

‡ Toſtat. 2. Reg. 17, Queſt. 27.

Hieron. Trad. Heb. in lib. 2. Reg. cap. 17.

* Liran. ibid.

(3) *They are Father* Camart's *Words, pag.* 126, 127, de rebus geſtis Eliæ.

King *Saul* (*b*), to cure him of his Fits of Frenzy, by the Sound of his Muſical Inſtruments [*B*]. A Service of that Importance made him ſo much beloved by *Saul*, that he kept him in his Houſe, and made him his Armour-Bearer (*c*). The Scripture ſays afterwards (*d*), that *David* uſed to go home from time to time to take care of his Father's Flocks, and that his Father ſent him one Day to *Saul*'s Camp, with ſome Proviſions for three of his Sons that were in the Army. *David*, performing that Order, heard the Challenge that a *Philiſtine*, called *Goliah*, proud of his Strength and gigantic Stature, made daily to the *Iſraelites*, which none among them durſt to accept. He expreſſed his great Deſire to fight that Giant; whereupon he was brought to the King, and aſſured him that he ſhould triumph over That *Philiſtine*. *Saul* gave him his Armour; but *David*, finding it troubleſome, put it off, and reſolved to make uſe only of his Sling; which he did ſo happily, that he brought down that Swaggerer with a Stone (*e*), and killed him afterwards with his own Sword, and cut off his Head, which he preſented to *Saul* [*C*]. That Prince asked his General, when he ſaw *David* go againſt *Goliah*, *Whoſe Son is this Youth* (*f*) [*D*]? The General anſwered, that he did not know, and received Orders from *Saul* to enquire about it: but *Saul* heard it himſelf from that young Man; for, being brought to him after the Victory, he asked him, *Whoſe Son art thou?* and *David* anſwered him, that he was the Son of *Jeſſe* (*g*). Then *Saul* kept him in his Service, without ſuffering him to return to his Father (*h*). But becauſe the Songs, that were ſung in all the Cities, on the Defeat of the *Philiſtines*, aſcribed ten times more Glory to *David* than to *Saul* (*i*), the King conceived a violent Jealouſy, which increaſed daily, becauſe the Employments, that he gave to *David* to keep him from Court, ſerved only to make him more illuſtrious, and to procure him the Affection and Admiration of the *Jews*. By a falſe Policy he would make him his Son-in-law: he was in hopes that the Condition, on which he was to give him his ſecond Daughter, would deliver him from that Object of his Averſion; but he was deceived in his Cunning. He asked an hundred Foreſkins of the *Philiſtines* for his Daughter's Dowry; *David* brought him two hundred in full tale (*k*): So that, inſtead of periſhing in the Enterprize, as *Saul* hoped, he returned with a new Addition of Glory. He married *Saul*'s Daughter, whereby he became

(*b*) Ibid. ver. 20.

(*c*) Ibid. ver. 21.

(*d*) Ibid. chap. xvii, ver. 15.

(*e*) Ibid. ver. 49, 50.

(*f*) Ib. ver. 55.

(*g*) Ib. ver. 58.

(*h*) Ibid. chap. xviii, ver. 2.

(*i*) And the Women anſwered one another, as they played, and ſaid, Saul *hath ſlain his Thouſands, and* David *his Ten Thouſands*. Ib. ver. 7.

(*k*) Ibid. ver. 27.

'*David*'s Father. Abulenſis *relates the ſame Tradition*, '*and* obſerves, that *Nahaſh* was the ſame with *Iſai* or *Jeſſe* '*David*'s Father; which *Liranus* had already obſerved.' For the reſt, thoſe, who would adopt the Impertinence of the *Rabbins* concerning *David*'s Conception, might eaſily admit another impertinent thing, which would be to place *David* in the number of illuſtrious Baſtards. The Phyſical Reaſon, that is alledged, why Baſtards are born ſo often with ſuch great Natural Talents, might take place here on the Father's Part.

(4) *That Book is intituled*, Precetti da eſſer imparati dalle donne Ebree. *See above, Rem.* [*A*] *of the Article* AARODON.

I have juſt now read an *Italian* Book (4), wherein this Story of the *Rabbins* is related in this manner. *David*'s Father loved his Servant-Maid, and after having cajolled her ſeveral times, he told her at laſt, that ſhe ſhould prepare her ſelf to lie with him that Night. She, being no leſs virtuous than beautiful, complained to her Miſtreſs, that ſhe could not be quiet for *Jeſſe*'s Sollicitations. *Che non poteva haver ripoſo, riſpetto che il patrone continuamente la tentava per far la giacere una notte con lui* (5). Promiſe him to ſatisfy him this Night, anſwered her Miſtreſs, and I will put my ſelf in your place. This was done two or three Nights one after another. When *Jeſſe* perceived that his Wife, with whom he had not lain a long time, was nevertheleſs with Child, he accuſed her of Adultery, and would not believe what ſhe told him of the Agreement ſhe made with her Maid. Neither he nor his Sons would ſee the Child ſhe brought into the World, but looked upon him as a Baſtard; he treated her with the utmoſt Scorn, and cauſed the Child to be brought up among the Shepherds in the Country. He did not reveal this Myſtery to his Neighbours, but concealed his Shame for his Childrens ſake. Things remained in that ſtate, till the Prophet *Samuel* went to look for a King in the Family of *Jeſſe*. His Choice not falling on any of the Sons that were ſhewed him, *David* was ſent for: it was done with Reluctancy, becauſe they feared that a ſhameful Secret would be diſcovered (6); but when they found that this pretended Baſtard was the Perſon that the Prophet looked for, their Thoughts were altered, and nothing was heard but fine Songs. *David* begun with a *Te Deum*; he praiſed GOD that he had heard his Prayers, and delivered him from the Scandal of Baſtardy. *Jeſſe* went on and ſaid; *the Stone that the Builders have refuſed, is become the Corner Stone, that ſhall ſupport all the Houſe*. His other Sons, *Samuel*, &c. ſpoke alſo ſome Sentences. The *Rabbi* adds, that *Jeſſe*'s Deſign was good, his Wife was old, and his Maid was young, and he deſired to get more Children. *Il penſiero d'Iſaï era buono perche eſſendo la patrona vecchia, e la maſſera giovane, havea deſiderio di haver altri figlivoli* (7). A fine Apology this! If ſuch Excuſes would do, what a multitude of leud Women would be ſecured from Cenſure! Was there ever any Doctrine about the direction of the Intention more convenient than this?

(5) Precetti da eſſer imparati, cap. 100, pag. 67.

(6) Ancora che Iſai non lo faceſſe con buona voluntà dubitando che ſi publicaſſe ſua vergogna. *Ibid. pag.* 68.

(7) Ib. pag. 69.

[*B*] *He was ſent to King* Saul *to cure him of his Fits of Frenſy, by the ſound of his Muſical Inſtruments.*] Many things might be ſaid on this Subject; but I refer you to the Collection of *Caſpar Læſcherus*, Profeſſor of Divinity at *Wittemberg*. Conſult his *Diſſertatio Hiſtorico-Theologica de Saule per Muſicam Curato*. It was printed at *Wittemberg* in the Year 1688.

[*C*] *He killed* Goliah *with his own Sword, and cut off his Head, which he preſented to* Saul.] *Goliah*'s Weapons were preſerved as a Monument of the Glory of the *Iſraelites*. *David* carried them firſt into his Tent (8); but it is likely they were afterwards in a conſecrated Place; for we read (9) that *David*, having asked the Prieſt *Abimelech* whether he had not a Spear or Sword for him, that Prieſt anſwered him: *the Sword of* Goliah *is here wrapped up in a Cloth behind the* Ephod; *if thou wilt take that, take it.* *David* cauſed it to be given him. As for the Head of *Goliah*, it was carried to *Jeruſalem* (10), when *David* had choſen that City for the Capital of his Kingdom. *Joſephus* ſays poſitively, that *David* himſelf conſecrated *Goliah*'s Sword to GOD (11).

(8) 1 Sam. xii, 54.

(9) Ibid. chap. xxi, ver. 8, 9.

(10) Ibid. cap. xvii, ver. 54.

(11) Joſeph. *Antiq.* lib. 6, cap. 11, & 14.

[*D*] Saul *asked his General —— whoſe Son is this Youth?*] It is ſomewhat ſtrange that *Saul* did not know *David* that Day, ſince that young Man had plaid ſeveral times on his Muſical Inſtruments before him, to diſperſe thoſe black Vapours that moleſted him. If ſuch a Narrative as this ſhould be found in *Thucydides*, or in *Livy*, all the Critics would unanimouſly conclude, that the Tranſcribers had tranſpoſed the Pages, forgot ſomething in one Place, repeated ſomething in another, or inſerted ſome prepoſterous Additions in the Author's Work. But no ſuch Suſpicions ought to be entertained of the Bible. Nevertheleſs ſome have been ſo bold as to pretend, that all the Chapters, or all the Verſes of the firſt Book of *Samuel*, are not placed as they were at firſt. It ſeems to me that the Abbot *de Choiſi* removes the Difficulty much better. '*David* was brought be-'fore *Saul*, *ſays he* (12), who did not know him at 'firſt, though he had ſeen him ſeveral times, when he 'ſent for him to play on the *Harp:* but as this was 'many Years before, and *David* was very young, and 'came to Court in the Quality of a Muſician, and 'was then dreſſed like a Shepherd, it can be no 'wonder

(12) Choiſi, *Hiſtoire de la Vie de David*, pag. 8, 9, Dutch Edit. 1692.

became ſtill more formidable to the King (*l*): all his Expeditions againſt the *Philiſtines* were very proſperous; his Name grew famous; he was in very great Eſteem (*m*); inſomuch that *Saul*, who knew his Son-in-law's Virtue much leſs, than the Humour of the People, imagined that the Death of *David* was the only thing that could ſecure him from being dethroned. He reſolved then to be rid of him, and truſted his eldeſt Son with that Deſign, who, far from ſiding with his Father's Jealouſy, gave *David* notice of that black Conſpiracy (*n*). *David* fled, and was purſued from Place to Place, till he had given undeniable Proofs of his Probity and Fidelity to his Father-in-law, to whom he did no manner of harm on two favourable Opportunities (*o*), wherein he might eaſily have killed him; upon which *Saul* reſolved to let him alone. But as *David* feared this Prince might reſume his wicked Deſigns, he ſtill kept upon his Guard. Nay, he provided himſelf a ſafer Place of Refuge, than before, in the Land of the *Philiſtines* (*p*). He aſked of the King of *Gath* a Town to dwell in, from whence he made frequent Incurſions into the Countries round about. After the Death of *Saul*, he returned into *Judea*, and was there proclaimed King by the Tribe of *Judah* (*q*). Nevertheleſs, the other Tribes ſubmitted to *Iſhboſheth*, the Son of *Saul*, which was effected by *Abner*'s Fidelity (*r*). *Abner*, who had been General of the *Army* under King *Saul*, placed *Iſhboſheth* upon the Throne, and ſupported him on it againſt the Attempts of *David:* but being full of Reſentment, becauſe *Iſhboſheth* reproved him for having taken one of *Saul*'s Concubines (*s*), he entered into a Treaty with *David* to procure him the Kingdom of *Iſhboſheth*. The Negociation would have been ſoon concluded, to the Satisfaction of *David*, if *Joab* (*t*), to revenge a private Quarrel, had not killed *Abner*. The Death of *Abner* only haſtened the Ruin of the unfortunate *Iſhboſheth*. Two of his chief Captains ſlew him, and brought his Head to *David*, who, far from rewarding them for it, as they expected, ordered them both to be put to death (*u*). The Subjects of *Iſhboſheth* quickly ſubmitted themſelves to *David*. This Prince had reigned ſeven Years and a half over the Tribe of *Judah:* afterwards he reigned about thirty Years over all *Iſrael* (*x*). This long Reign was remarkable for great Succeſs, and glorious Conqueſts. It was not much diſturbed but by the wicked Attempts of this Prince's own Children [*E*]. Theſe are commonly the Enemies which Sovereigns have moſt reaſon to fear. *David* was very near being reduced to the low Condition, in which *Samuel* found him. Humanly ſpeaking, this Reverſe of Fortune would have been unavoidable [*F*], if he had not found ſome Perſons about his Son *Abſalom*, who acted the Part of Traitors (*y*). *David*'s Piety is ſo conſpicuous in his *Pſalms*, and in many of his Actions, that we cannot ſufficiently admire it. He is a Sun of Holineſs in the Church: he there diffuſes, by his Writings, a fruitful Light of Conſolation and Piety, which cannot be enough admired; but that Sun had it's Spots [*G*]. The Life of that great Prince, publiſhed by the Abbot *de Choiſi*, is a good Book, and would be much more uſeful, if he had taken the Pains to ſet down in the Margin the Year of

(*l*) Ibid. ver. 29.

(*m*) Ibid. ver. 30.

(*n*) Ibid. chap. xix, ver. 1, 2.

(*o*) Ibid. chap. xxiv, and xxvi.

(*p*) Ibid. chap. xxvii.

(*q*) 2 Sam. chap. ii, ver. 4.

(*r*) Ibid. ver. 8.

(*s*) Ib. chap. iii.

(*t*) He was General of *David*'s Army.

(*u*) 2 Sam. chap. iv.

(*x*) Ibid chap. v, ver. 5.

(*y*) Ibid. chap. xv, ver. 34, &c.

'wonder that a King, full of Buſineſs, and whoſe Mind 'was diſtempered, ſhould forget the Features of a 'young Man's Face, who had nothing conſiderable in 'him.' I only wiſh he had not ſaid, I. That *Saul* had not ſeen *David* for many Years. II. That *David was very young* when he came to *Saul*'s Court in the Quality of a Muſician. There is no likelihood that he was much younger when he killed *Goliah*, than when he came the firſt time to *Saul*'s Court; for when he made his firſt Journey, he *was a mighty valiant Man, and a Man of War, and prudent in Matters* (13); he was but Thirty Years of Age, when he was elected King after the Death of *Saul*; and there muſt be neceſſarily an Interval of many Years between the Death of *Goliah*, and that of *Saul*. See the Remark, wherein I criticize *Moreri*, and the Remark [*I*].

(13) 1 Sam. xvi, 18.

[*F*] *His Reign was not diſturbed, but by the wicked Attempts of his own Children.*] The moſt remarkable of their wicked Attempts, was the Revolt of *Abſalom*, who forced this great Prince to fly from *Jeruſalem* in a mournful Condition. He went with his Head covered, bear-footed, melting in Tears, and his Ears filled with the Lamentations of his faithful Subjects (14). *Abſalom* entered *Jeruſalem* as in Triumph; and, that his Party might not abate of their Zeal, from a Notion that this Difference between Father and Son would be made up, he did one thing ſufficient to make them believe he ſhould never be reconciled to *David*. He lay with the ten Concubines of This Prince, in the ſight of every body (15). It is very likely, this Crime would have been forgiven: the extreme Affliction, into which his Death threw *David*, is a Proof of it. *David* was the beſt Father that ever lived: his Indulgence to his Children was exceſſive, and he himſelf was the firſt that ſuffered for it. For, had he puniſhed the infamous Action of his Son *Amnon*, as it deſerved (16), he would not have had the Shame and Sorrow to ſee another revenge the Injury done to *Tamar:* and had he chaſtized, as he ought, the Perſon who revenged this Injury, he would not have run the hazzard of being entirely dethroned. *David* had the Fate of the moſt part of great Princes: he was unfortunate in his own Family. His eldeſt Son raviſhed his own Siſter, and was killed by one of his Brothers for that Inceſt: the Author of this Fratricide lay with the Concubines of *David*.

(14) 2 Sam. chap. xv.

(15) Ibid. chap. xvi.

(16) He raviſhed *Tamar*, and was killed for this Crime by the Order of *Abſalom*, who was *Tamar*'s own Brother, both by Father and Mother. *Ibid. chap. xiii.*

[*F*] *He was very near being reduced to the Condition —— in which* Samuel *found him —— this reverſe of Fortune was unavoidable.*] We may ſee by this Example, that there is no depending upon the Fidelity of the People; for, in ſhort, *David* was both a great and good King. He was beloved, he was eſteemed, and had all imaginable Zeal for the Religion of his Country. His Subjects, therefore, had reaſon to be ſatisfied, and if they had been to chuſe a Prince, could they have wiſhed him better qualified? Nevertheleſs, they were ſo unſteady in their Duty to *David*, that his Son *Abſalom*, in order to get himſelf declared King, needed only to make himſelf popular for ſome time, and keep ſome Emiſſaries in each Tribe. This Maxim, *Caſta eſt quam nemo rogavit, —— She is a chaſte Woman that has never been ſollicited*, may very well be applied to the People. The reaſon we do not ſee Princes oftener dethroned, is, becauſe the People have not been ſollicited to revolt by Intrigues well enough managed. Nothing elſe is neceſſary: if the Prince be not wicked, they know how to make him paſs for ſuch, or for a Slave to wicked Counſel. Pretences are never wanting, and provided they be artfully ſupported, they paſs for a juſt Reaſon, how weak ſoever they are in themſelves.

[*G*] David *was a Sun of Holineſs in the Church of GOD ---- but that Sun had it's Spots.*] The numbering of the People was a thing which GOD looked upon as a great Sin (17). His Amour with the Wife of *Uriah*, and the Orders he gave to cauſe the ſame *Uriah* to be killed (18), are two very enormous Crimes. But he was ſo troubled for them, and attoned by ſo admirable

(17) 2 Sam. chap. xxiv.

(18) Ibid. chap. xi.

of each Fact, and the Places of the Bible, or *Joſephus*, upon which he grounds his Aſſertions. A Reader would be glad to know, whether what he reads flows from a ſacred or prophane Source. I ſhall not obſerve many Faults in *Moreri* [*H*]. The Article of *David*, which I have juſt read in the Dictionary of the Bible, will ſupply me with Matter enough for a Remark [*I*].

admirable a Repentance, that this Paſſage of his Life does not a little contribute to the Inſtruction and Edification of faithful Souls. We learn by it the Frailty of the Saints, and it is a Precept for Vigilance: We may learn thereby in what manner to lament our Sins, and it is an excellent Example. As to the Remarks, which ſome Critics would make, to ſhew that in ſome other Actions of his Life he deſerved to be much blamed, I ſuppreſs them in this Edition, and with the more Pleaſure, becauſe ſome Perſons, who are much more knowing in theſe kind of Matters than I, have aſſured me that all thoſe Clouds of Objections are eaſily diſperſed when it is remembred: I. That he was King by Divine Right during the Life of *Saul*. II. That he had with him the High Prieſt, who conſulted GOD to know what was to be done. III. That the Order given to *Joſhua*, to exterminate the Idolaters of *Paleſtine*, was ſtill ſubſiſting. IV. That many other Circumſtances drawn from Scripture may convince us of *David*'s Innocence in a Conduct, which conſidered in general ſeems to be an ill one, and which would be ſo at this time.

[*H*] *I ſhall not obſerve many Faults in* Moreri.] Only five.

I. *David* was Twenty two Years of Age, when *Samuel anointed him with the Oil deſigned for the Conſecration of Kings*. This is inconſiſtent with what follows, and with what goes before. That Author had been ſaying that *David* was born in the Year of the World 2950; and a little while after he tells us, that *David* conquered *Goliah* in the Year of the World 2971. It is plain, that the Victory over *Goliah* was obtained after the Anointing of *David*; whereas, according to *Moreri*, the Ceremony of the Unction was not performed till a Year after that Victory. To mend this Fault, it muſt be ſaid, that *David* received the Unction at twenty Years of Age (19). The reſt needs no correction; for it is true that *David* conquered *Goliah* the Year after his Unction.

(19) According to *Calviſius*, he was born in the Year of the World 2860, and anointed by *Samuel* in the Year of the World 2880, and he killed *Goliah* the Year after.

II. It is not true that *Saul* renewed his Perſecution againſt *David*, when the latter had twice abſtained from doing him the leaſt Harm, having the moſt favourable Opportunity in the World for it. It is ſomewhat ſurpriſing, that the Scripture, in order to aggravate *Saul*'s Crime, does not obſerve that he ſoon repented of his Reconciliation with *David*, and that he made himſelf guilty of a black Ingratitude. In the Twenty fourth Chapter of the Firſt Book of *Samuel*, he is informed, that *David*, having it in his Power to kill him in a Cave, would do him no kind of Harm: he admires that Generoſity; he deſires GOD to reward it; he acknowledges that the Crown is deſigned for *David*; he recommends his Family to him, and returns to his Houſe. In the Twenty ſixth Chapter of the ſame Book, he hears, that *David*, having it in his Power to kill him in the Night in his Tent, goes away without doing him any harm; he admires that Generoſity; he gives *David* his Bleſſing; he foretels him all manner of Proſperity, and goes Home. *Moreri* pretends that theſe two things, ſo like one another, happened in one Year. I repeat it again. It is ſomewhat ſurpriſing, that the Scripture does not make uſe of the firſt of thoſe two Facts, to make *Saul*'s Obſtinacy in perſecuting his Son-in-law more odious. Two or three lines would have had a great effect: The Reader would have been ſhocked to ſee that *Saul*, indebted to his Son-in-law for his Life, praiſes him, admires him, gives him a thouſand Bleſſings, and yet a little while after purſues him to deſtroy him. Doubtleſs the Laws of a Narration require, that, in ſpeaking of this new Purſuit, it ſhould be obſerved, that it was a Violation of that ſolemn Agreement that followed the Adventure of the Cave; and yet there is not one tittle in the Scripture concerning that Circumſtance. Here are other Subjects of ſurpriſe. *David*, repreſenting to *Saul* that he did not deſerve the Perſecution he ſuffered, and that he could have killed him in his Tent, did not repreſent that it was the ſecond time he had the King's Life in his Hands, and that the King had ſoon forgot what had happened in the Cave. *Saul* on his part, who owns himſelf in the wrong, and who ſpeaks to *David* in moſt obliging Terms, does not obſerve that it is the ſecond time that he owes his Life to him. It muſt be confeſſed that ſuch Circumſtances do not uſe to be forgotten. Moreover we ſee that, in the firſt of thoſe two Adventures, *David* and *Saul* uſe almoſt the ſame Words as in the ſecond. If I ſaw two Narratives of this Nature either in *Ælian*, or in *Valerius Maximus*, I ſhould make no difficulty to believe that it is one and the ſame Fact, which having been reported two different ways, ſerved for the Subject of two Articles, or of two Chapters. The Fact would be this: *David*, having *Saul*'s Life in his Hands, who was his cruel Perſecutor, did carefully preſerve it. The two ways of relating it, would be, I. That *Saul*, being obliged by a natural neceſſity to go aſide from his Men, went into a Cave where *David* was. II. That *David* ſlipt in the Night into *Saul*'s Tent, the Guards being in a deep Sleep. I leave it to Father *Simon*, and the Critics of his Rank, to examine whether it be poſſible, that the Hiſtorical Books of the Old Teſtament ſhould relate the ſame thing twice. It ſeems to me that the Action of the *Ziphites*, related in the Twenty third Chapter of the Firſt Book of *Samuel*, is not different from that which is related in the Twenty ſixth Chapter of the ſame Book. Whoever goes about to compare thoſe two Accounts, will doubtleſs be of my Opinion. What is very certain, is, that *Saul* did not perſecute *David* after the ſecond Reconciliation. This is *Moreri*'s ſecond Fault.

The IIId conſiſts in his ſaying, that *David was ſo well received by* Achiſh, *King of* Gath, *that his new Favour was like to make the Grandees rebel*. There is not one Word of Truth in all this, and I ſee nothing that might occaſion that Falſity, but the Suſpicions that were entertained of *David*, when they ſaw him with his Men in the Rear of the Army of the *Philiſtines*. The Commanders would abſolutely have him return into the City that was given him (20). There was a great Difference between thoſe Commanders, and the Grandees of the King of *Gath*'s Court.

(20) 1 Sam. chap. 29.

IV. The pretended Diſcontent of the Grandees did not oblige *David* to retire from that Court. But he retired out of Reſpect: he feared that he and his Men ſhould incommode the Prince by their Abode in the chief City: therefore he deſired *Achiſh* to aſſign him another Place to live in, which was granted him. This happened before the Commanders of the *Philiſtines* required that *David* ſhould march out of their Camp.

V. *Moreri* ſhould not have ſaid, that *David returned* to *Ziklag*, ſince he had not ſaid that he had already ſojourned there.

[*I*] *The Article of* DAVID *in the* Dictionary of the Bible *will ſupply me with Matter for a Remark.*] The Printers were come thus far, when a Dictionary was ſhewed me (21), which I conſulted immediately at the Article of the Prophet *David*, and I find ſome Paſſages in it that give me occaſion to make the following Obſervations. I. It is not true that *David* was born One hundred and ten Years before the Birth of JESUS CHRIST: there is above One thouſand Years (22) between the Birth of the one and the Birth of the other. II. The Author ſtrives to remove the Difficulty that is obvious to all Readers, when they conſider that *Saul* did not know *David* on the Day that *Goliah* was killed; I ſay he ſtrives to remove it, and intangles himſelf more than he ſhould; for he ſays in one place (23), that *David*, being ſeventeen Years of Age, went to play on the Harp before *Saul*; and, in another (24), he gives him but fourteen or fifteen Years, and the Stature of a *very little Boy*. A little after, going about to refute thoſe who ſay, that the Fight with *Goliah* preceeded the *playing on the Harp*, he raiſes a ſpecious Objection againſt himſelf, grounded on this, *viz.* That thoſe who propoſed *David* as a fit Perſon to drive away, with his Muſic, the evil ſpirit that afflicted *Saul*, gave him the Character of a valiant Man and a good Warrior (25). *I anſwer*, ſays he, *that it ought not to be concluded from theſe two words*, Fortiſſimum & Bellicoſum, *that the Fight was before the playing on the Harp, ſince the Name of ſtrong may be given to any one that is truly ſo according to his Age. Is it not a ſign of great Strength*

(21) It is the *Dictionary of the Bible* compoſed by Mr *Simon*, Prieſt, and Doctor of Divinity, and printed at *Lyons*, 1693, in *folio*.

(22) 1090, *according to* Calviſius.

(23) Pag. 249.

(24) Pag. 259.

(25) Et reſpondens unus de pueris ait, ecce vidi filium Iſai Bethlemitem ſcientem pſallere, & fortiſſimum robore, virum belliceſum, &c. *Ibid. pag.* 249.

to

OBSERVATIONS upon a Narration in the Books of *Samuel*.

to purſue Bears and Lions, and to fight with and choak them? This Anſwer ſuppoſes that *David* being, as yet *very little, and a Youth of fourteen or fifteen Years of Age*, fought with Lions, took them running, and ſtrangled them, and might be called a ſtrong Man, a Warrior and a Man that ſpoke well. This Difficulty is great enough to deſerve to be ſolved; how comes it then that our Author does not ſeem to have the leaſt glimpſe of it? Notwithſtanding his Silence, the diſcerning Readers will eaſily perceive, that ſince *David* fought with *Goliah* at the Age of twenty one Years (60), he muſt have been near twenty Years of Age the firſt time he went to *Saul*'s Court. And thus the Reaſon that our Author gives for the beſt, why *Saul* did not know *David* the Day he fought with *Goliah*, is inſignificant (61). That Reaſon is, that a little Boy alters ſo much in his Face in ſeven Years time, that thoſe who do not ſee him till after an Abſence of ſeven Years do not know him again. This is not *David*'s Caſe, and therefore ſome other Reaſons muſt be alledged. The Author mentions thoſe which ſeveral Commentators have imagined. If they do not fully ſatisfy thoſe, whom it is no eaſy thing to ſatisfy, it muſt be aſcribed to the nature of the Queſtion. III. The Author forgets the ſtrongeſt Proof, that can be alledged, againſt thoſe who will have it that *David* was not ſent for to drive away the evil Spirit from *Saul*, till after his Fight with *Goliah*. He does not ſay that they confound the Order in which things are related in the Scripture; he does not ſay that *Saul*'s Servant, who praiſed *David* for being ſtrong, valiant, eloquent, and handſome, did not ſpeak of the Victory obtained over *Goliah*. Now it is impoſſible to apprehend that thoſe, who had a mind to recommend him to the King after that Combat, ſhould have been ſo ſtupid as not to tell the Prince, in a Word, *That ſame young Man, who killed* Goliah, *plays well upon Inſtruments, and he will cure you.*

For fear of being too long, I ſhall not examine whether the Author has wanted Exactneſs in the reſt of the Article. He has avoided the Inconveniency which I have obſerved in the Abbot *de Choiſi*; for he ſets down the Years wherein *David* did ſuch and ſuch things.

(60) It is the Suppoſition of the Author of the Dictionary of the Bible, pag. 249.

(61) He quotes the Author of the Hiſtory of the Bible, who reckons eight Years between the firſt and the ſecond time that *Saul* ſaw *David*, and who ſuppoſes that *David* was but fifteen Years of Age the firſt time.

DAURAT *(a)* (JOHN), in *Latin Auratus*, a learned Humaniſt, and a very good Poet, was a *Limoſin* [*A*], and of an ancient Family. It is ſaid, that he left his Family-Name [*B*], to take another, which occaſioned a great many Puns [*C*]. Being gone to the chief City of the Kingdom *(b)*, to finiſh his Studies, he made an extraordinary Progreſs in Learning, and diſtinguiſhed himſelf in ſuch a manner by his Knowledge of the *Greek* Tongue, and his Genius for Poetry, that he became one of the Profeſſors of the Univerſity of *Paris*. He is ſaid to have ſucceeded *John Stracellus*, in the Year 1560, in the Office of the King's Reader, and Profeſſor of the *Greek* Tongue *(c)*; but before that

(a) *He is alſo called* Aurat, d'Aurat, Dorat.

(b) Papyr. Maſſo in Elog. Jo. Aurati.

(c) Du Breul, Antiq. de Paris, pag. m. 565.

[*A*] *He was a* Limoſin.] *Thuanus, la Croix du Maine, du Verdier*, Mr *Menage*, and ſeveral others make him a Native of *Limoges*. It may be queſtion'd whether they are well grounded, ſince *Papyrius Maſſo* ſays, he was born near the Head of the *Vienne* (1). If he was born in the chief City of *Limoſin*, I do not think that his Friends, in their Encomiums upon him, would have aſſign'd, for the Place of his Birth, a Village, which they do not ſo much as name.

(1) Papyr. Maſſo, in Elogio Jo. Aurati.

[*B*] *Of an ancient Family; whoſe Name, they ſay, he quitted.*] He was of the Family of *Dinemandi* and *Bremondais* (2). It is ſaid (3) that the Name *Dinemandi* ſignifying, in the Language of the Country, *Diſne-matin*, (a Morning-Dinner) and having ſomething mean in it, (4) did not pleaſe him, and that he chang'd it into that of *Daurat*, which ſignifies in *Gaſcon* the ſame thing as the French word *doré* (*gilded*), and was formerly given to one of his Anceſtors, becauſe of his light Hair. Others pretend, that our Poet took that new Name, becauſe the Place of his Birth was ſituated on the little River *Aurance* (5). Mr *Menage* informs me, that *Daurat*'s Mother was of the Family of *Bermondet* (6); and therefore *la Croix du Maine* is wrong, who calls it *Bremondais*. *Naudé* does not forget our *Daurat*, when he ſpeaks (7) of thoſe who changed their family Names: *Illud —— pro Joanne* Mane-Pranſo, *Auratum —— exhibet.* Mr *Menage* denotes *Daurat* under the Name of *Ortbrophagus*, in his Metamorphoſis of *Gargilius Macro*. See hereafter the Remark [*D*] of the Article GOULU (NICHOLAS.)

(2) La Croix du Maine Biblioth. pag. 201.

(3) Menage, Remarq. ſur la vie d'Ayrault, pag. 186. Baillet, Auteurs deguiſez, pag. 155.

(4) Viz. *The Cuſtom of dining too ſoon.*

(5) Coulon, Rivieres de France, Part. 1, pag. 323.

(6) Menage, ubi ſupra, pag. 186. 499.

(7) Naud. Præf. in Opuſc. Niphi.

[*C*] *To take another Name, which occaſioned a great many Puns.*] They could not fail of it in an Age, wherein Equivocations, Quibbles, and Puns, were in Faſhion; but now they are quite out of Doors. We find in *Du Verdier Vau-Privas* (8) a Sonnet full of Gilding, or Alluſions to Gold, in Honour of *John Dorat*. The Learned *Francis Hotman* thought, without doubt, that he had met with a happy Turn, when he made this Diſtich againſt him:

Ex ſolido eſſe prius vulgus quem credidit auro,
Extrorſum auratus, plumbeus intus erat. (9).

He, whom Mankind pure Gold *eſteem'd before,*
Proves but a lump of Lead *juſt* gilded *o'er.*

(8) Bibl. pag. 685, 686.

(9) Matagonis de Matagonibus ad Italogalliam Matharelli, pag. m. 248.

Neither *Daurat*, nor his Diſciple *Ronſard*, found their Account in turning their Muſes againſt the Proteſtants; the Match was not even. *Daurat*, uſing a very mean Metaphor, writ againſt the Frogs of the great Lake of *Geneva*, and compared them to the Frogs mentioned in the *Revelation*. Wiſely done, indeed, to mention to them the *Revelation!* The Proteſtants feigned, among other Things, in their Anſwer, that their Frogs, inſtead of croaking, cried out, AU RAT, AU RAT, *de Limouzin*, (the word *Rat* is an alluſion to *Daurat*), and complained of the RONSES (*Briars*) of *Vandomois* (10), (*Ronſes* is an Alluſion to *Ronſard.*) They returned alſo his abuſe in Specie, for they call'd him the *Limouſin* Frog. (11) *Hotman* calls him *Turnip-eater* (§ *a*). 'Vidi multos, *ſays he* '(12), qui dicebant quod illa carmina melius valebant 'aureum quam omnia poëtaſtrorum epigrammata in 'fine tui libri poſita duos denarios, etiam ſine excipi-'endo ſuum vicinum Lemovicem raphanophagum Joh. 'Auratum. —— *I have ſeen many*, ſays he, *who main-'tained, thoſe Verſes were better worth a piece of Gold, 'than all the Poetaſters Epigrams, placed at the end of 'your Book, were worth two Pence, not excepting thoſe of 'their Neighbour John Daurat, the Turnip-Eater of Li-'moſin.*' I cannot tell whether *Daurat* ever put into Verſe the Anſwer that he made uſe of againſt a Miniſter of *Geneva*, who had told him, *that the ſign of the Croſs, which the* Catholics *make, ſeems to be intended to drive away the Flies. Du Verdier Vau-Privas*, who relates (13) that Anſwer (14) with great Approbation, pretends that *Daurat*, coming through *Geneva*, in his Return from *Italy*, was ſollicited to embrace *Calviniſm*, and that they promiſed him *a good Salary, but that he could not uſe himſelf to that Doctrine.* Doubtleſs it was after that Journey, that he wrote that Poem, that drew a ſhower of Alluſions upon him.

(10) *See* Caraſſe, Doctrine Cur. pag. 127.

(11) Le Labour. *Addit. to* Caſtelan. Tom. 2. pag. 674.

(12) Ubi ſupra, pag. 247.

(13) Proſopogra-phie, Tom. III, pag. 2575.

(14) *It turns upon this, that* Beelzebub *ſignifies* Prince of the Flies.

[§ *a*] The Word *Raphanophagus*, uſed by *Francis Hotman*, ought to be rendered by *mâche-rabe (Turnip-Eater)* which is the nick-name of the People of the Country of *Limoges*, particularly the Peaſants, ſuch as *Daurat*, to judge of this Man by his ruſtic outſide. *The Devil take this Turnip-Eater* (maſche rabe) ſays *Pantagruel*, in *Rabelais*, book 2. chap. 6. ſpeaking of a School-Boy of *Limoges*, who *beſhit his breeches*, whilſt That Giant was preparing to devour him. We know beſides the *Magnificat* of the Peaſants of *Limoges*: 'Monſiour S. Marſau noſtre bon fondatour, Préga 'pour nous noſtre Seignour, qu'il nous veuille bien 'garda noſtra raba, noſtra caſtagna, noſtra fama. Al-'leluia. *i. e. Monſ. St Marſau, our good Founder, pray 'for us to our Lord, that he will be pleaſed to preſerve 'our Turnips, our Cheſnuts, and our Wives. Alleluia.*' As the Peaſants of *Limoges* are very poor, and, for want of Corn, feed upon a ſort of Turnips, or large Navews, which they give themſelves not even time to boil, hence came this Nick-name, which reproaches theſe poor People with their Poverty, and the ill Blaſts one is expoſed to, when near them. *John de la Bruyere-Champier, lib. 9. cap. 2.* of his Book *De re cibaria*, where